DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 232 FL 010 860

AUTHOR	Hauptfleisch, T.
TITLE	Language Loyalty in South Africa. Volume 3: Motivations to Language Use: Opinions and Attitudes of White Adults in Urban Areas. Languages Survey First Report.
INSTITUTION	Human Sciences Research Council, Pretoria (South Africa).
REPORT NO	TLK/L-10
PUB DATE	79
NOTE	134p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Human Sciences Research Council, Private Bag X41, Pretoria 00001, Republic of South Africa (R2.55)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Afrikaans; Bilingualism; English; *English (Second Language); *Language Attitudes; Language Research; *Language Usage; Motivation; *Second Languages; Sociolinguistics; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	English Speaking; *Language Loyalty; South Africa; *South Africans

ABSTRACT

This volume reports on the results of a survey conducted to determine the language attitudes of South Africans. Speakers of Afrikaans as a first language (Afrikaners) appear more willing than native speakers of English (ESSAs) to use a second language (L2), but only outside the family circle. The ESSA feels comfortable using the L2 with the family. An Afrikaner is willing to employ the L2 in all role relations, except with a servant; and ESSA is likely to speak the L2 to a social inferior for functional rather than prestige reasons. Three types of motivation for observed patterns of L2 usage are discussed: (1) functional motivation, (2) reference group attraction (integrative motive), and (3) reference language status. The need to use English and the prestige of English are important motivations for Afrikaners, whereas the ESSA finds Afrikaans of little practical use. However, the Afrikaner has a strong positive or negative reaction to being taken for an English speaker, while the ESSA is little concerned about this factor. Thus L2 behavior patterns reflect an interaction of various motivations. Data are presented in tabular form, and a bibliography is appended. (Author/JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SOUTH AFRICAN HUMAN SCIENCES RESEARCH COUNCIL

ED180232

LANGUAGE LOYALTY IN SOUTH AFRICA

volume 3: motivations to language use: opinions and attitudes of White adults in urban areas

LANGUAGES SURVEY
FIRST REPORT

T. HAUPTFLEISCH, M.A.

INSTITUTE FOR LANGUAGES, LITERATURE AND ARTS

DIRECTOR: DR. K.P. PRINSLOO

FL010860

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Human Sciences Research Council

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PRETORIA

1979

Report No. TLK/L-10

Price: R2,55

ISBN 0 86965 571 X

HUMAN SCIENCES RESEARCH COUNCIL

Private Bag X41, Pretoria 0001, Republic of South Africa

Telephone: 48-3944 Telegrams: RAGEN

President: Dr A.L. Kotzee

Vice-Presidents: Dr J.D. Venter and Dr A.J. van Rooy

Secretary-Treasurer: B.H. Steyn, M.Com., M.B.A., B.Ed., A.C.I.S., L.I.A.H.

Institutes of the HSRC

Communication Research

Educational Research

Historical Research

Information and Special Services

Languages, Literature and Arts

Manpower Research

Psychometric Research

Research Development

Sociological, Demographic and Criminological Research

Statistical Research

Administration

Function of the HSRC

The HSRC undertakes, promotes and co-ordinates research in the human sciences, advises the Government and other bodies on the utilization of research findings and disseminates information on the human sciences.

PREFACE

Since 1970, the Human Sciences Research Council has been engaged in a large-scale, country-wide study of the multilingual situation in South Africa, a project undertaken at the request of the then Minister of Education and Cultural Affairs (now the Minister of National Education). This project entails a detailed study of language habits, preferences, attitudes and usage among all the major population groups in the country.

This present report, the third in a series of four intended to study the language attitudes among White adults in South Africa, is based on data provided by the first of the large-scale surveys, undertaken during 1973-1974 in all the major urban areas.

This report deals with motivations to language selection and use in contact situations. The other reports in the series deal respectively with attitudes concerning bilingual policy in South Africa (Report No 1), attitudes towards using and improving usage in the second language (Report No 2), and language loyalty, language purity and language shift (Report No 4).

Reports on the results of similar surveys undertaken among the Black population (1975) and all the inhabitants of South West Africa (1976) will be published shortly.

A. L. Hotzé
PRESIDENT

CONTENTS

		Page
	SUMMARY	iii
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Background, theory and concepts	1
1.2	A sociolinguistic research project	5
1.2.1	Sample and Survey	5
1.2.2	The attitude questions	5
1.2.3	The variables	6
2.	SOCIAL DISTANCE, ROLE RELATIONS AND LANGUAGE USE	10
2.1	Introduction	10
2.1.1	The questions and basic data	10
2.2.2	Social distance and the use of the languages	13
2.2.3	Role relations and the use of the languages	15
2.2.4	Social status and certain role relations	17
2.2.5	Some conclusions	21
3.	MOTIVATION AND LANGUAGE USE	22
3.1	Introduction	22
3.2	The questions	22
3.3	Results	24
3.3.1	Language identity and motivations for speaking L2	24
3.3.2	Sex differences	27
3.3.3	Age differences	28
3.3.4	Bilinguality	33
3.3.5	Socio-economic status	35
3.3.6	Language milieu	36
3.3.7	Regional differences	41
3.4	Conclusion	42
4.	MOTIVATIONS BEHIND BILINGUAL LANGUAGE BEHAVIOUR AMONG WHITE SOUTH AFRICANS : AN HYPOTHESIS	43
4.1	Introduction	43
4.2	Discussion	44
4.3	Conclusion	50
Appendix I	The survey sample	51
Appendix II	The tables	53
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	89

SUMMARY

In this Volume, the third in a series of four intended to study language attitudes among Whites in the Republic of South Africa, the accent has been on motivations towards using the second language. What factors precipitate certain language behaviour patterns among people?

To study some of the possible factors involved, the responses of 1 697 persons living in the urban areas of South Africa were analysed.

In the first section of the report a look is taken at the effect of social distance and role relationships on willingness to speak L2. Important differences in attitude among Afrikaners and ESSAs were revealed in the process.

Firstly it was found that the Afrikaner normally appears more willing than the ESSA to employ L2, but only in situations outside his family circle. The ESSA, on the other hand, apparently feels more secure using L2 with intimates and therefore is more willing than the Afrikaner to do so in family circles.

Secondly, whereas the Afrikaner seems likely to employ L2 in all role-relations, except with servant, the ESSA reacts differentially. He is more likely to speak L2 to a social inferior, and more probably because of functional or adaptive (accomodative) considerations than other social reasons (e.g. prestige or integrative tendencies).

All of which points to fundamental differences in motivation that obtain for Afrikaners and ESSAs.

The second section of the report then deals with some of the motivations behind a willingness, and indeed alacrity at times, to speak L2.

Basically three types of motivation are tentatively studied: functional motivation, reference group attraction (i.e. W.E. Lambert's "integrative motivation") and reference language status (i.e. prestige which L2 has, cf. Labov, 1966). While to study these motivations in detail would require the use of a battery of specifically designed attitude scales, the questions employed do give a few pointers if interpreted with care.

It appears that functional reasons ("I need English") and the prestige of English are important motivations where the Afrikaner is concerned, whereas the ESSA finds Afrikaans of little practical use, although it is socially relatively valuable. However, the Afrikaner reacts strongly - either positively or negatively - to being taken for an English speaker, whereas the ESSA is little concerned about this factor. Thus integrative motivation is not a simple yes/no matter in South Africa, since it involves a specific set of anti-integrative values among the Afrikaners.

These patterns are basically true of all the variables, only being more accentuated by matters such as a person's degree of bilinguality and contact with L2. And above all, these motivations are seldom found working alone. They rather form part of a greater motivational pattern, where the various types of motivation interact upon one another to produce a certain behavioural reaction in a specific contact situation.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND, THEORY AND CONCEPTS

1.1 Background: Society and language behaviour

South Africa is a country of bilinguals and multilinguals. History has ordained this, and the constitution has confirmed the bilingual character of the society (cf. Act No. 32 of 1961, Section 108). The role of any individual language in this multilingual society - with its multi-cultural qualities - is therefore highly complex, a complexity which is one of the main incentives for this study.

In a unilingual society the role of the local language is determined entirely by society. Likewise the roles assigned to foreign languages are normally easily determined, for they lie outside the normal functioning of society itself. In a bilingual or multilingual society, be it one where the languages, or language groups, are of equal status or one where some are of subordinate status, the individual is presented with a range of options from which he may choose, freely or not, depending on the rigidity of the given social structure and his own personal commitments. In the case of a unilingual speaker within a bilingual society, one would hypothesize that the strongest determinant would be the speaker's very unilingualism, which reduces both his options and his social mobility. In the case of the bilingual speaker the full complexity of societal pressures and role expectations become manifest, since, theoretically, the choice of options is free.

In this South African study we have thus far (Volumes 1-2) come across both of these cases. While the unilinguals are few, there are many kinds of bilinguals (vide the definitions in Section 1.2.3), largely differentiated by their degree of bilinguality*. The majority of South Africans are ranged over the whole spectrum from *poor* to *good* bilinguals.

In this multilingual society, therefore, a great range of potential motivating forces may become operative when two or more people meet, forcing them into selecting a language (also a dialect, code or style of a language) for communicative purposes.

One of these is the primary factor of the individual's language repertoire, as well as that of his interlocutor(s). But given a gathering of bilinguals of differing language identities the selection of a common language for communication - if one is sought - can depend on such matters as the topic of conversation (do all those present have a sufficient range of vocabulary in the field?), the numerical balance of the language groups present, the degree of

*For this term cf. 1.2.3(b).

intimacy and role relations which apply, and the attitudes of the individual speakers.

Thus the contact situation itself will define the reaction, even such slight matters as the place where the meeting takes place (the building, the city) becoming a factor.

The proficiency and attitudes of the individual are in turn shaped by a number of societal factors, often noted and employed as variables in the foregoing study. Thus home background (the values and habits acquired there, the linguistic environment), medium of instruction at school, language experience (L2 exposure and experiences with L2 speakers throughout life), and present language environment are important determinant factors.

More fundamental is the value system which has arisen from the individual's total social experience. Matters such as cultural aims, political beliefs, ambitions and self-image are undeniably factors in all social behaviour, including language behaviour. The place language identity holds within this value system is of consequence to any reaction to a contact situation - within the limits imposed by the situation itself. In the case of the Afrikaner, his language identity is a primary factor of his value system, perhaps the most obvious distinguishing characteristic he has. To deny his language is to deny his Afrikanerhood, and therefore his whole cultural heritage.

While this is not so obviously the case with the ESSA, his language not being as closely allied to his identity as in the case of the Afrikaner, the rejection of English and the adoption of Afrikaans would be no less of a wrench to him.

In view of this link between language identity and value system, L2 language behaviour will eventually depend largely on the role and value assigned to L2 within the individual's value system - a role determined by all the social factors mentioned above.

In the foregoing volumes we have thus far studied opinions on the bilingual policy of South Africa and the willingness to learn and employ L2 in everyday situations. The basic question studied in this volume is now:

What are the fundamental motivations behind the desire to speak L2 under certain circumstances, and, more particularly, to prefer doing so?

This question will be studied from a variety of angles, firstly (sections 2 and 3) by means of the empirical data culled from the survey and then (section 4) by means of certain theoretical hypotheses based on these data.

1.1.2 Language, identity and the White South African adult

Because South African society naturally falls into four principal categories, normally typified as White, Coloured, Asian and Black (Bantu) groups, these reports make a distinction between these ethnic groups for purposes of research and comparison. This first series of reports deals with the White Afrikaans-speaking and English-speaking adults in urban areas. Later reports are to pay more specific attention to the other ethnic groups.

The majority of Whites in South Africa speak one of the two official languages, English and Afrikaans, or both. But language has a deeper significance in the relations between these two groups. It is in this respect that Bettina J. Huber has called language "the traditional South African polariser". This fact is borne out by a study among White South African elites (Van der Merwe *et al*, 1974, pp. 153-4), and it is difficult to deny that language identity has historically proved to be the single most effective token of ethnic solidarity in this country. Language identity forms one of the three basic characteristics of the Afrikaner as usually defined, along with religious affiliation and political affiliation (Van der Merwe, 1974, pp. 32-34; 155-156). A similar, easily identified pattern does not exist among English-speaking South Africans today.

Thus, basically, in the study of attitudes and concepts concerning language in South Africa it must be remembered that one is dealing with two different sets of values and social norms and socio-historic traditions, and that the factor one is studying - language - is the most important dividing factor.

1.1.3 Terms and concepts

For the sake of clarity brief definitions of a few key concepts, as they are employed in the body of this study, are provided*.

Firstly, *attitude* will be used for the deep-seated and private "state of readiness" or "propensity to act in a certain way", according to Allport's well-known definition * (Allport, 1935), while *opinion* will be used to indicate the more public, i.e. more easily expressed and more easily influenced belief, attitude or value. Opinions, too, are important, for they create the climate within which the deeper founded attitudes are formed. In a direct questionnaire, normally opinions are obtained, not true attitudes.

---

*A fuller discussion of the implications involved in any study of attitudes and the rationale for the type of questions employed in this survey is contained in Volume 1, Section 1.3.2. of this series.

A *stereotype* is defined in Rokeach's terms as "a socially shared belief that describes an attitude object in an oversimplified or undifferentiated manner" (1969, p. 125). In other words, the public opinion of society in general, as contrasted with the opinion of each individual within that society. Stereotypes, too, are very important to the formation of the social climate within which language preferences act.

A type of attitude often referred to today is *prejudice*, a specialised form which is perhaps best defined by Allport (1954, p. 9): "Ethnic prejudice is an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole, or toward an individual because he is a member of that group." It will be employed in this way.

Finally, though language loyalty has been defined, two concepts within it now need to be established and named: *Language of identification* and *mother tongue*. In the context of this study, when an English speaker is spoken of, the reference is to one who speaks English as a home language, who has identified himself as an English-speaker. Respondents in the survey were obliged to select either an English or Afrikaans questionnaire for completion on the basis of their language identification. This, in itself, is an expression of attitude. The whole problem of *language shift*, which is a basic indication of a shift in allegiance or loyalty, is linked to language identity. Thus *first language* is normally used to mean *language of identification*. *Mother tongue* is only used where it is in actual fact the mother's language that the respondent is using.

1.1.4 Some abbreviations

To avoid the clumsy terminological circumscriptions of "English-speaking South African" and "Afrikaans-speaking South African", the abbreviations *ESSA* and *Afrikaner*, popularised by the 1820 Settlers' Conference held in Grahamstown (1974), are used in the report. In contrast the term *the British* indicates non-South Africans from the *British Isles*, even though they may be living in South Africa as temporary residents. A plural form for ESSA, namely ESSAs, is used.

A few other abbreviations have also been introduced:

L1 = language of identification, first language
L2 = second language, the other offical language
L3 = third language, any language other than Afrikaans or English
A = Afrikaans
E = English
A/E = Afrikaans and English
A/E/B = Afrikaans, English and a Bantu language

1.2 A SOCIOLINGUISTIC RESEARCH PROJECT

1.2.1 The sample and survey

During the course of 1973 and the early part of 1974 the field-work on which this survey is based was completed. A random sample of one in every 375 names was drawn from the latest (1972) voters' roll, concentrating on White South African citizens living in urban areas with populations of more than 10 000 inhabitants. This limitation was set, since about 86,8 per cent of the White population is urban* and because language shift and contact is most likely to occur in the high density areas. This provided a target number of 2 000 respondents as well as a number of reserves to provide for losses through deaths, migrations, rejections and similar hazards.

Of the total sample approximately four-fifths (1607) were finally contacted. Each respondent received a letter explaining the purpose of the survey and asking for co-operation. Following this a field-worker arranged for an interview where two questionnaires were completed by the respondent and samples of his language use (in both English and Afrikaans) were recorded on tape.

The questionnaires sought to elicit information on the various functions for which the respondent uses the two languages (in written and spoken forms), his proficiency in the second language and his language loyalty. The second questionnaire concentrated on reading and book-buying habits. The tape-recordings were intended for two purposes: firstly, to get a sample of the respondent's L1 use and, secondly, to get a sample of L2 use for later intensive analysis, against the background of the respondent's L1 use.

Such was the general project. In Appendix I tables are provided to give a breakdown of the sample, according to a number of standard social variables.

1.2.2 The attitude questions

The questions on which the following interpretations are based were contained in the questionnaire entitled "The use of English and Afrikaans in the urban areas of South Africa",** which also included a biographical section providing information on the person's sex, age, marital status, highest educational qualification, church affiliation, occupation, income, city of residence and period of residence there, other places of residence, origin and language identity of parents and grandparents and finally, his own language identity as well as that of his wife and children.

---

* Based on 1970 census figures

** Cf. Appendix II in Volume 1 of this series.

The various questions were set to elicit opinions and attitudes on a number of cardinal facets of language loyalty and language use, either directly or indirectly. The facets are

(a) The importance of the two languages in general, for all citizens;
(b) the personal importance which the languages have for the respondents;
(c) the respondent's norms for using the two languages and his motivations;
(d) the language 'loyalty' of the respondent, his language identity.

In the discussions to follow the questions are not categorised rigidly according to the scheme provided above, but are employed as needed.

It must also be emphasized that it has not been the intention of this project to design an attitude or language loyalty scale. Selection, assessment and rejection of attitude questions were done on the basis of the required information, the previous experience of other researchers and the experience gained from reactions in the pilot study.*

1.2.3 The variables

The variables employed in this report are the following:

language identity, sex, age, socio-economic status, bilinguality, language background, language experience, language environment and present area of residence.

While these variables are fully discussed in Volume I, the less well-known may briefly be described here:

(a) Socio-economic status

For the purposes of this study it was hypothesized that the status of the family to which the individual respondent belongs would have a significant effect on his or her attitudes. Fortunately there was already at hand an index of socio-economic status for South African conditions, evolved by H.G. Strijdom of the HSRC. He took the three indices (educational level, occupation and income) and worked out a cumulative score for each. Thus an average social status score could be had by the following formula: $\frac{\Sigma EOI}{3}$. The rationale behind this can be found in Strijdom, 1971.

For the purposes of this study the threefold index was not quite suitable, but one based on educational level and occupation alone could be used easily enough. Income was left out because income levels have changed so rapidly in the past years that they cannot be considered a reliable re-

* Cf. Volume I of this series for some more details. The pilot study is that of K.P. Prinsloo (1972).

flection of socio-economic class over any extended period of time. Furthermore, there is the problem that many respondents did not reveal their incomes.

So, by a simple adjustment, Strijdom's scale was adopted to employ only educational level and occupation, thus providing a useful scale of three socio-economic levels. I have termed these upper class, middle class and lower class.

(b) Bilinguality

A bilinguality scale was devised in an attempt to ascertain whether attitudes towards the second language may be correllated. This measure was arrived at by a recodification of question 30. This is an assessment by the respondent of his own language proficiency according to three elements: pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar.

By various means the responses were recoded into a four-point scale with the following categories: *Good, Fair, Weak, Unable to Speak L2.* This means that what one has eventually is a scale indicating people with good or exceptional bilingual ability (i.e. theoretically, *in their own estimation* speaking both languages equally well), people with fair bilingual ability (i.e. able to speak both languages, but the second only "acceptably" well), people with weak bilingual ability (i.e. barely bilingual, whose second language use is "not quite acceptable", but still able to get by in restricted circumstances) and people who are unilingual (i.e. unable to speak the second language at all).

The term *bilingual* and *bilinguality* is used here in a sense limited strictly as regards two points:

Firstly it is confined to the South African situation. The person is bilingual or unilingual only in terms of Afrikaans and English, although this does not imply that he knows only one or the other or both of these languages. A person may be a fluent English/French bilingual but be considered *unilingual* for this study because he cannot speak Afrikaans. In general discussions of international findings and theories of bilingualism, this restriction cannot apply; it is only for the data of this particular survey that the restriction is needed.

A second limitation may more properly be seen as a working definition of bilinguality for this survey: A person is deemed *bilingual* if he is able to carry on a conversation (i.e. understand, respond to and contribute to the conversation) in his second language. Such a definition presupposes various *degrees* of bilinguality, measured in comparison with the person's

proficiency in the first language*. Our somewhat elementary scale is an attempt to cater for such diversity.

What this definition excludes, however is *passive* command of the second language (reading or mere understanding). While our scale, based on a command of grammar and vocabulary, may also elicit answers based on passive command (the item *pronunciation* could have been a control here, but was poorly responded to), the question was framed in such a way as to elicit response only with respect to conversation:

"30 How well can you speak Afrikaans when suddenly presented with the opportunity of conversing for a minute or two with a stranger on a topic which you know well and can talk about? Please indicate, by means of crosses, how good your usage would be as far as pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar are concerned."

(c) Language background, language experience and language environment

A tremendous influence on attitudes - which are part and parcel of the personality of the respondent - is exerted by his social milieu. Hence the concern with status. Also the concern with environment. In the case of language a number of environmental influences may affect a respondent's feelings about the particular language , especially the amount and type of contact he has had with the language at various stages in his life.

For the purpose of this investigation we distinguish three stages of influence: language background (i.e. the language spoken at home and in the neighbourhood up to 18 years of age), early language experience (the extent to which the second language was used in the society in which the respondent has lived and worked since childhood) and language environment (i.e. the present position).

To facilitate the use of these stages as variables, a number of recomputations of answers to specific questions were made so as to derive four scores: one each for language background (based on question 2 and 3), earlier language experience (question 3 and 4), language environment (question 14) and present city of residence.

The language background scale used makes provision for six variations of background. They are :

---

*This scale is a 'self-evaluative' one. The tape-recorded conversations between respondents and interviewers are to be objectively assessed by qualified judges and the results will appear in a later publication. It will be interesting to compare the correlations of those "objective" assessments and the attitude questions, with the correlations to be drawn with the scale discussed in this report. Unfortunately the objective bilingualism score is not yet available.

1 = unilingual L1 home, often spoke L2.

2 = unilingual L1 home occasionally spoke L2.

3 = unilingual L1 home, never spoke L2.

4 = mixed L1 & L2 home, often spoke L2.

5 = mixed L1 & L2 home, occasionally spoke L2

6 = unilingual L2 home, often spoke L2*.

The language experience scale has four variations:

1 = spoke L2 outside the classroom up to 18 years of age and also later because of the environment in which he lived or worked.

2 = spoke L2 outside the classroom up to 18 years of age, but not later.

3 = did not speak L2 outside the classroom before 18 years of age, but did later because of the environment in which he lived or worked.

4 = did not speak L2 at any time outside the classroom or in any environment in which he lived or worked.

The present language environment is more complex, consisting of a nine-point index. (This index is however not a continuum.)

1 = Do not use L2 in conversation.

2 = Occasionally have the opportunity of brief and casual conversations in L2.

3 = Occasionally have the opportunity of brief and casual as well as serious conversations in L2.

4 = Often have the opportunity of brief and casual conversations in L2.

5 = Often have the opportunity of casual conversations in L2. Occasionally have the opportunity for serious conversations.

6 = Often have the opportunity to have both casual and serious conversations in L2.

7 = Occasionally have the opportunity of serious conversations in L2.

8 = Often have the opportunity of serious conversations in L2.

9 = Occasionally have the opportunity of casual conversations in L2, and often of serious conversations.

(d) Present city of residence

Lastly we have a look at the present city/urban communities in which the respondents reside. These have been classified into 15 areas, according to language "colour". Seven of these are used in the discussions, namely Pretoria, Johannesburg, The Vaal Triangle, Bloemfontein, Natal, The Eastern Cape and Cape Town.

---

*This group has undergone a language shift, and therefore the language background description here is not quite comparable to that of the other groups, since L2 here signifies the respondent's former language identity. More will be said of this factor in Volume 4 in this series.

The above are the variables according to which the attitude questions are to be discussed in the following chapters. The way in which they are to be employed and interpreted will depend on the questions and the findings themselves. However, it must be pointed out here that because of the size and distribution of the sample, and the type of deductions made, it was not deemed wise to study too many variables together. For particular reasons, therefore, each variable will be studied separately, the only additional factor taken into account being the basic division between ESSAs and Afrikaners.

2. SOCIAL DISTANCE, ROLE RELATIONS AND LANGUAGE USE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This report is intended to ask, quite simply, Why does the respondent speak the second language? This "why" can have many facets and elicit just as many answers. At present we are concerned with two such facets: the social role the respondent is prepared to assign to his second language and the kind of motivation behind his willingness to speak the language.

2.1.1 The question and basic data

It is difficult to define the social roles of the languages in the South African bilingual situation (beyond the stereotyped expectations of the respondents as described in Volume 1). However, some attempt was made in the questionnaire to delimit by quantitative means the spheres within which the language function. While the data provided by questions 13-15 were meant primarily as a census of patterns of language use among South Africans, to be used in a later Report by K.P. Prinsloo, a selection of the findings are of importance here as background material for what is to follow.

Two types of selections were made. Firstly we considered the effect *social distance** might have on the opportunities to speak the second language. Four stages of distance were hypothesized, namely the *relatives* (spouse, family and other relatives) *friends*, *acquaintances* and *strangers*. The point is, in which of these spheres are opportunities for speaking the second language most likely to occur? Table 2.1 provides some information in this respect.

A second selection is related to this, but pays more particular attention to *role relations* ** between respondent and other groups in society. Question 15

---

* The term employed very generally here to indicate much the same as Robert E. Park did when he originally coined it: the degree of intimacy between the respondent and the group concerned. Of course, there is little correspondence between this grouping and the famous scale by Bogardus. The purpose is not the same. Perhaps something like "degree of intimacy" might be an alternative.

** I follow Sherif and Sherif (1969) in preferring this term; for the accent here is, inevitably, on the relations.

provides the data for this approach, confronting the respondent with twelve situations, or suggested participant groups in a social situation. These situations are referred to as *spheres* (*terreine* in Afrikaans) in the questionnaire. The situations, or possible role relations, range from highly informal ("In connection with sport") to the relatively formal ("In financial matters and at your bank"), and also from situations in which the respondent will use the language with "superiors" (i.e. people he may look up to), to those in which he has to deal with "equals" and, eventually, to those in which the co-respondent may be an "inferior" (i.e. a person he would tend to look down upon). A stratification of relationships, then, whereby the roles of the language in the respondent's socialization process may be charted. Two variables function on the resulting continuum, namely the social position of the respondent himself (to define the groups to be designated "superior" and "inferior) and the social situations available to the respondent by virtue of his patterns of social contact.

In Table 2.2 only the latter variable has, in part, been accounted for, the numbers given in each case being the actual N of respondents who have opportunities for speaking the second language in that particular sphere. However, this does not give an indication of whether the respondent does in actual fact have *any* dealings in that sphere, in his first language at least. It is important to realize therefore that these data and the resultant profile apply only in cases where the second language *could have been used in the situation.* We could assume therefore that in the remaining cases the mother tongue would have been available for use had the respondent intended using it, but such an assumption would not be unassailable.

A concrete example may be more to the point. Let us assume the repondent is an ESSA housewife, living in an Afrikaans environment (eg. Bloemfontein) and a person who does not have any dealings at the bank. She is unable therefore to assess the opportunities for speaking the second language (Afrikaans) in that sphere. Nor can she indicate what her reactions under hypothetical situations would be, since she has had no experience of the situations. In tabulating her responses, it would appear as if she did not have the opportunities for speaking Afrikaans at the Bank. The assumption (which may be incorrect, Bloemfontein being 80,6 per cent Afrikaans) is then that she has opportunities for speaking L1 (English) only, and therefore does not use L2 (Afrikaans) in that sphere.

This type of mistake is easy to make, and could lead to serious misinterpretation of the quantitative data given below. For this reason no attempt is made to define the relative roles of both first and second language, but simply of the second language alone.

As for the point from which the respondent views the other groups (i.e. his own position in the hierarchy), which allows him to determine his evaluation of them, as either "inferior" or "superior", no direct control could be exercised. Other methods will be employed to study the factor of role relationships in section 2.2.4, when socio-economic status is correlated with these responses.

TABLE 2.1*

THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPEAKING THE SECOND LANGUAGE AT VARIOUS DEGREES OF SOCIAL DISTANCE, AND THE PERCENTAGE WHO MAKE USE OF SUCH OPPORTUNITIES

	Afrikaners		ESSAs	
	N who have the opportunity	% who use it	N who have the opportunity	% who use it
Spouse	256 (27,9)	78,0	146 (21,2)	85,0
Relatives	238 (25,9)		168 (24,4)	
Friends male	444 (48,4)	88,6	269 (39,0)	86,9
Friends female	452 (49,0)		268 (38,9)	
Acquaintances	605 (69,9)	90,6	450 (65,3)	81,2
Strangers	724 (78,9)	90,9	504 (73,2)	83,7
TOTAL N (possible number)	918 100,0%		689 100,0%	

*These Tables, based on the full Tables F/1 and F/2 in Appendix II , were derived by means of a recodification of Questions 13 and 15 in the Questionnaire (cf. Volume 1, Appendix II). For the method employed, the reader is referred to Volume 2 in this series, where the recodification of Question 14 is described.

TABLE 2.2*

THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPEAKING THE SECOND LANGUAGE IN VARIOUS SITUATIONS OF ROLE RELATION, AND THE PERCENTAGE WHO MAKE USE OF SUCH OPPORTUNITIES

	Afrikaners				ESSAs			
	N who have the opportunity		% who use it		N who have the opportunity		% who use it	
1 To Grocer	726	(79,1)	91,0	1 To Servants	382	(55,4)	93,1	
At Shop	619	(67,4)		2 To Non-professionals	366	(53,1)	89,3	
2 At Work	536	(58,4)	96,7	3 At Work	326	(47,3)	90,4	
3 To Professionals	366	(39,9)	88,9	4 At Shop	226	(32,8)	77,8	
4 To Non-professionals	352	(38,3)	89,7	To Grocer	167	(24,2)		
5 At Bank	273	(29,7)	90,1	5 To Professionals	137	(19,9)	80,9	
6 At Club	233	(25,4)	90,4	6 At Sport	140	(20,3)**	82,6	
At Sport	207	(22,5)		At Club	133	(19,3)		
7 To Servants	194	(21,1)	84,3	7 At Bank	124	(18,0)	85,4	
TOTAL POSSIBLE N	918			POSSIBLE N	689			

2.2.2 Social distance and the use of the languages

From table 2.1, under *opportunity*, it would appear that there is a definite correlation between social distance and opportunities for speaking the second language. For both language groups, it holds good that the further a particular group is removed from intimacy, the greater the chances are that the respondent will be given an opportunity to employ his second language in a contact situation.

There are no great differences between the Afrikaners and the ESSAs in this regard, except for the item of *friends*, where almost ten percent more Afrikaners indicated that they have opportunities for speaking English. This is in line with the general tendency for the Afrikaner to seek out such opportunities more

* See footnote on page 12.

** *Professionals* are placed ahead of *Sport* in this group, despite the fact that slightly more respondents indicated the latter, because, for later computations *Sport* and *Clubs* are combined as *Social relations* and the average percentage is only 19,8 per cent as compared to the 19,9 per cent of the Professional option.

often than do ESSAs (cf. Volume 2) for *friends* are generally selected, rather than incidentally met or provided by circumstance as in the case of relatives or acquaintances.

Against this background of opportunities, the data reflecting the extent to which the groups are prepared to employ the second languages are interesting. These data appear as a percentage under the heading "use it" in table 2.1.

The most obvious difference between the two language groups is this: With the Afrikaners, the greater the social distance, the greater the willingness to use the second language. (The jump from *relatives* to *friends*, in particular, is large.) With the ESSAs on the other hand, although the differences are not nearly as great, this relationship is inverted. The greater the social distance, the less the willingness to speak the second language. In other words, the ESSA is more willing to use his second language in a contact situation with an intimate (relatives, friends) than with a relative stranger (acquaintance, stranger).

In general, then, this table is a valuable differentiation of the finding of Volume 2, namely that the Afrikaner is normally more willing to employ his second language than is the ESSA. The Afrikaner is more willing to do so, but only in situations outside his family relations. In contrast to the 78,0 per cent Afrikaners, 85,0 per cent of the ESSAs indicated that they would use their second language among relatives, whereas the percentages in the *strangers* bracket are 90,9 per cent and 83,7 per cent respectively for the Afrikaners and ESSAs. On the other hand, the ESSA apparently feels more secure using his second language with intimates, therefore more ESSAs than Afrikaners are willing to use the second language among relatives.

Obviously a number of factors may be relevant here, but two have been touched on before: the relative insecurity felt by the ESSA concerning his usage of Afrikaans, which may tend to lead to his rather speaking to an intimate than a stranger, and the attitude towards preserving Afrikaans, fostered among Afrikaners. This latter attitude (to be studied in more detail in Volume 4) would lead to a stronger sense of betrayal if the language is used in family circles than would be the case with the ESSAs. The next section will pay more attention to this possibility.

However, these reflections are based on very small differences, which may possibly indicate a trend, but cannot be taken as conclusive, although they add substance to emerging profiles of the Afrikaner and the ESSA.

2.2.3 Role relations and the use of the languages

Table 2.2 has been drawn up in such a way as to present the various situations in which a respondent would have an opportunity of speaking his second language in rank order, according to the number of respondents. The rank orders for Afrikaners and ESSAs differ markedly, as one would expect, outlining, even more clearly than question 39, the language patterns of South African society.

Against this background, the willingness of the respondents to use the second language may be judged. Table 2.3 gives the rank order of situations in which the respondents indicated that they made use of such opportunities.

TABLE 2.3

THE PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WHO MAKE USE OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPEAKING THE SECOND LANGUAGE IN THE VARIOUS SITUATIONS

	Afrikaners		ESSAs	
1	Work	96,7%	Servants	93,1%
2	Shopping	91,0%	Work	90,4%
3	Sport	90,4%	Non-professional	89,3%
4	Bank	90,1%	Bank	85,4%
5	Non-professional	89,7%	Sport	82,6%
6	Professional	88,0%	Professional	80,9%
7	Servants	84,3%	Shopping	77,8%

Here the table indicates how consistent the responses of the Afrikaners are. Besides the very high percentage who are prepared to speak English at work (this is found among ESSAs as well), between 88,0 per cent and 91,0 per cent of them are prepared to use English in all other situations. The only real exception is the case of *servants*.

Servants in the South African context can be equalled quite simply to *domestic servants* and therefore, *ipso facto* imply *African (Black) servants*. It is an elliptical phrasing which would be quite understandable to all South Africans, for in the history of South African society, the White domestic servant has been something of a rarity. For this reason, the fact that the Afrikaner is less willing to speak English is probably ascribable to the generally held belief that a Black person speaks Afrikaans, a stereotype supported by the responses of the ESSAs, 55,4 per cent of whom indicate that they have opportunities for speaking Afrikaans to servants.* The Afrikaner would then normally

*It is quite possible to challenge this belief. Among the Black population, English is currently gaining rapidly, both in currency and popularity. An extension of this Language Project among Blacks has provided interesting data on this. (cf. G.K. Schuring, 1977).

assume that the Black is able to speak Afrikaans (and not able to speak English?) and, accordingly, address him in that language.

On the other hand, the ESSA is by far most willing to speak Afrikaans to servants. Again this may be ascribed to the stereotyped idea that the Black servant speaks Afrikaans, but because of the more marked differences between the responses to the various situations, a closer study of other possible factors may be of value.

(a) If the top three situations indicated by the ESSAs are studied, in contrast to the last four, they may possibly be typified as of two kinds, namely contact situations with people whose respect is of no consequence to the respondent (servants and non-professionals - artisans, mechanics, etc. - hired help in other words) and, secondly, a contact situation in which the normal respondent is left with no option but to employ his second language (his work). The remaining four situations are of a more social and consequential nature, the respondent perhaps desiring the respect of these people (banker, his social equals at the club, professionals) more than of the other groups mentioned. In other words, the relative social positions or role relations of the respondent and the contact group may be a decisive factor.

In the pilot study this phenomenon was studied by means of four questions (20,21, 32, 33 - cf. Prinsloo, 1972). The conclusion in that case was that the ESSA student was more willing to speak the second language to his social inferior [i.e. "to speak it down (rather) ... than to speak it up" - in the words of Prof. L.W. Lanham as quoted by Prinsloo, 1972, p. 84] than was his fellow student at the Afrikaans university. Since the norms for a "social inferior" and a "social superior" were much more simplified in the pilot study ["a respected person from the other language group" and "children from the other language group" or "Bantus (Blacks) from an area where the second language is spoken"], more information is needed on the data provided by this study. Which groups are to be considered the respondent's "superiors" and which his "inferiors"? In the heterogenous sample at hand, the only measure for this is to consider the respondent's own socio-economic position. This will be done in section 2.2.4.

(b) What makes a closer analysis of the hypothesis propounded above imperative is the fact that a very simple, and equally possible explanation exists for the given results.

Comparing Table 2.2 and Table 2.3 it will be noted that the first three situations selected by the ESSA respondents as the ones in which they are given most opportunities for speaking Afrikaans, are also the ones in which

they indicated that they would be most willing to employ the language. Thus, considering the fact that they place *shopping* last (and *shopping* is placed clearly first in the list of opportunities, for speaking *English* by Afrikaners) it would seem that the ESSA could consider the Black and the non-professional as being unable to speak English, and he therefore saves himself the trouble of even trying to use anything else but his second language in such a situation.

In other words, the stereotyped opinions held about the spheres of *non-professionals* and *servants* may turn these situations into contact situations of the type represented by *work:* the respondent has no choice. Or else it may be seen as a manifestation of the accomodative or adaptive tendency noted in Volume 2.

This argument, based on the same slight differences in response noted before, could be as valid. However, it leads one to the other basic topic of this chapter, namely, the type of motivation behind the employment of a second language. Factor (b) above thus introduces specific forms of motivation for using L2, namely a "functional" motivation ("instrumental" as W.C. Lambert has termed it*) or some form of "adaptive" behaviour (cf. Section 4 for this term). The former factor (a), is a prestige factor, serving not only a functional but also a social purpose. It involves the social standing accorded to the language ("prestige" in Labov's terminology, 1966) or the language group ("integrative motivation", as Lambert termed it).

More will be said of this in sections 3 and 4.

2.2.4 Social status and certain role relations

To test the hypothesis that the ESSA is less inclined to speak his second language to social superiors than is the Afrikaner, the social status** of the respondents was matched with their responses to some of the situations given in tables 2.1 and 2.2. The data are summarized below in Table 2.4.

---

* He distinguishes between *instrumental* motivation, as motivation because of an actual, particular *need* for the language in everyday life, and *integrative* motivation, because of a desire by the respondent for integration in the other society, a desire for acceptance and identification. In experiments he found the integrative motivation the most powerful factor in language learning (cf. Gardner and Lambert, 1959 and Lambert *et al.*, 1962).

** Cf. 1.2.3.

TABLE 2.4

CLASS DIFFERENCES AND ROLE RELATIONS

		Upper		Middle		Lower	
		Afr. %	ESSA %	Afr. %	ESSA %	Afr. %	ESSA %
The extent to which they speak L2 to:							
Professional people	often	81,0	71,7	79,7	67,5	77,8	89,5
	occasionally	7,6	11,7	8,4	10,0	12,5	0,0
	never	11,4	16,7	11,9	22,5	9,7	10,5
	(total N)	(105)	(60)	(143)	(40)	(72)	(19)*
Non-Professional people	often	85,4	83,0	82,4	83,5	84,3	78,3
	occasionally	4,9	8,5	5,9	7,6	9,6	8,7
	never	9,7	8,5	11,8	9,3	6,0	13,4
	(total N)	(103)	(153)	(136)	(118)	(83)	(46)
Servants	often	80,0	90,4	75,4	90,3	80,0	79,7
	occasionally	5,5	6,6	8,7	3,2	8,9	8,4
	never	14,6	2,9	15,9	6,5	11,1	11,9
	(total N)	(55)	(136)	(69)	(124)	(45)	(59)

Three situations were selected for this table, namely contact with *professional* people (doctors, lawyers, dentists, etc.) *non-professional* people (artisans, mechanics, builders, etc.) and *servants*. Theoretically they represent three classes, namely an *upper*, a combined *lower middle/lower* and what is really a *labourer* class. The last-mentioned is a social class not represented in our index, and one peculiar to South Africa. No real *middle class* situation which would be suitable for our purposes was included in the list of items in question 15, so these three will have to suffice.

In terms of the hypothesis, the upper class will consider the *professionals* their "equals" and the other two groups their "inferiors", the middle class will consider the *professionals* their "superiors", the *non-professionals* as their "equals" or "inferiors" and the servants as their "inferiors"; and the lower class will consider the *professionals* as their "superiors", the *non-professionals* as their "equals", and the servants as their "inferiors". Because of the flexibility of the socio-economic status index, however, these assessments are not rigid, and may only serve as a guideline. The only true assessment is most probably that *servants* would be accepted as "inferior" by all groups. Never-

* The N here is most probably too small to be meaningful.

theless, the resulting table does seem to indicate enough differentiation by the various classes to make some deductions possible.

With the Afrikaners there seems to be a modest trend for them to prefer speaking the second language to *non-professional* rather than the other two groups, but this holds true for all three classes, so it is merely a reflection of the general trend also to be observed in table 2.3.

If their responses are compared with those of the ESSAs a definite pattern emerges, particularly with respect to the upper and middle classes. When given an opportinity for speaking the second language to a superior, more Afrikaners than ESSAs make use of it even in the upper class, where *professionals* ought to be considered equals. A seeming exception is the lower class, who are slightly less willing than the middle class Afrikaners but are completely surpassed by the ESSA lower class. However, this exception is most probably more apparent than real, since a mere 19 lower class ESSAs indicated that they actually had opportinities for speaking Afrikaans to professional people. The number is far too small to provide reliable results here.

Nevertheless, the ESSA lower class remains an intriguing group, who differ significantly from the middle and upper class groups in their responses to these questions. Reference to this difference has been made in the preceding report and will again be made later on in this volume.

When the opportunity for speaking the second language to *non-professional* people arises, there appears to be hardly any difference between the Afrikaners and ESSAs in willingness to use the second language. In fact, should one consider the percentage who also answered *occasionally*, the ESSAs even lead slightly (by 1,2 per cent for the upper, 2,8 per cent for the middle class). Once more the lower class differs, the Afrikaners being far more prepared to use their second language under these circumstances (the difference is 6,9 per cent should the *occasionally* option be added). As the N is also much larger this time (46), the difference gains in significance.

Finally, given the opportunity to employ the second language in a contact situation, with *servants*, the ESSAs who make use of the opportunities significantly outnumber the Afrikaners who are willing to do so, at least in the upper and middle classes. In the lower class the two groups are about even, approximately 88 per cent of each group being prepared to use the second language in conversation with an "inferior", whether often or occasionally.

From the data it would further appear that our basic hypothesis could hold true, *for the upper and middle classes:* the ESSA is more likely to speak in his L2 to his

inferiors than to his superiors if given the opportunity. This tendency is patently clear when reading table 2.4 down, under *Upper-ESSA* and *Middle-ESSA*. It can also be traced by noticing how the *occasionally* option diminishes as one proceeds from *professional* to *servant*. The contrast with the more stable pattern of the Afrikaners is revealing and would point to a gradual gain of confidence among the ESSAs as we go lower down the socio-economic ranks.

In other words, these data seem to confirm the existence of a sense of insecurity among ESSA speakers of Afrikaans, a sense of insecurity markedly less apparent among Afrikaners regarding their English*. To paraphrase the words of L.W. Lanham, quoted previously: the Afrikaner is prepared to speak his second language up or down, the ESSA rather down than up.

But what of the recaltritant lower socio-economic group? The Afrikaners obviously pose no problem, since they are in line with the other groups, but the ESSA lower group are a different matter. Here, unlike the upper and middle groups, there is no difference in their responses to the *professional*, *non-professional* or *servants* items. If the occasionally option is added to the *often*, the percentages are 89,5; 87,0; 88,1 per cent respectively.

A number of solutions are possible. Firstly, we may have a selected group here, because of the small numbers. They may simply be a group who have opportunities for speaking the language and, through familiarity with it, have lost their inhibitions concerning its use. But then this ought to have happened to the other groups as well. This is a distinct possibility, if one thinks of the large percentages from all groups who indicated they use the language, even in the most demanding social situations (with *professionals* or "superiors").

Otherwise the lack of similar differences between Afrikaners and ESSAs in the lower class could mean that the ESSA lower class is the most bilingual of the three ESSA groups. A quick look at this factor ought to be possible. As there is no table available which compares the socio-economic status index and the bilinguality measure, we have to make do with the nearest approximation to it. Strijdom (1971), on whose work the status index was based, employed a revised version of it, which uses a single index - the occupational status of the respondent**. Although his index reveals a much larger lower class than is

---

* This idea was first introduced into this study in Volume 2.

** Vide Strijdom, 1971, pp. 20-22 and in particular ch. 4 pp. 24-30. Lever (1966) also finds occupation the most reliable single measure of social status in South Africa, while occupation formed the basic norm for the selection of White South African elites in van der Merwe et al., (1974).

evident from the one employed in this study, it will be sufficient for answering the question asked before: how bilingual are the various social classes?

By the same token, because the full bilinguality measure is not available, in this study the respondent's own assessment of his proficiency is used as far as *grammar* is concerned. As pointed out before (2.3.1), this measure corresponds satisfactorily with the full *bilinguality* measure.

TABLE 2.5

BILINGUALITY OF THE RESPONDENTS : BY SOCIAL CLASS

Percentage	Afrikaners Upper	middle	lower	ESSAs Upper	middle	lower
Good	63,0	50,0	35,1	26,5	24,2	28,1
Fair	31,5	37,0	38,8	42,2	33,0	28,9
Weak	5,5	13,0	25,0	28,1	37,9	32,9
Cannot speak L2 at all	0,0	0,0	1,1	3,3	5,0	10,2
TOTAL N	127	208	376	121	182	246

From this table it becomes clear that, unlike in the case of Afrikaners, there is little difference between the two lower ESSA social classes as far as a good or fair knowledge of the second language is concerned. However, 25 (65,8%), of the 38 ESSAs unable to speak Afrikaans at all, are of lower class, 9 (23,7%) are middle class and only 4 (10,5%) are upper class. In effect, then, this negates the possibility that the lack of distinction which characterizes the status group in the use of the second language in the different role relationships may be ascribed to higher proficiency. The reason has to lie elsewhere.

A third solution is postulated here merely as a suggestion for possible consideration in further research: the existence of a *sense of language consciousness*, which makes some people more aware of, and more sensitive to language issues - language rights, language purity, language as a social factor. Here one may perhaps ask, is this lower class not lacking in such a sense? Are these respondents not simply more concerned with other problems or factors, unaware of the social implications of "correct" usage, or are their self-imposed standards of proficiency not simply lower, more pliable?

2.2.5 Some conclusions

Whatever the reasons for these reactions, the following factors have at least been isolated thus far:

(a) Social distance (degree of intimacy) has a definite, if not highly significant, influence on willingness to speak the second language, (a direct correlation with Afrikaners, and inverted correlation with ESSAs).

(b) On the other hand, role relations seem to exert an influence on the willingness to employ the second language only in the case of the ESSAs, who are far more willing to speak Afrikaans "down" than "up". Afrikaners, of all social groups, although slightly more strongly among the upper class, are willing to employ English under all circumstances.

Basically then we have concluded that there is a fundamental difference in the type of motivation the two language groups have for speaking the second language. The next section of this volume pays brief attention to this factor.

3. MOTIVATION AND LANGUAGE USE

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Reference has already been made to what Gardner and Lambert (1959) term *instrumental* and *integrative* motivations for learning the second language. In this section attention will be paid to the extent to which these and other forms of motivation function among Afrikaners and ESSAs respectively. It may even be possible that the differences between the two groups and their attitudes towards the two languages may be partly explicable in terms of differences in motivation.

3.2 THE QUESTIONS

Five questions (28, 38, 29, 27 and 40) were asked to ascertain why respondents employ L2.* In The Pilot (Prinsloo, 1972) was found that more Afrikaans-speaking students prefer their second language as a communication instrument - for both rational reasons (the language has functional use, is easier to use) and emotional reasons (the language is a better sounding, "nicer" to use).

As Prinsloo points out, the distinction between the "rational" and the "emotional" considerations are difficult to maintain, since they are often closely related, and this will have to be borne in mind with what follows.

In the current study question 28 was included, as a measure of "rational" or "functional" motivation ("Instrumental" in Lambert's terminology**). It was

---

*Cf. Appendix II of Volume 1 of this series for the full questionnaire.

** Gardner and Lambert (1959)

reinforced by using question 38: "Do you place yourself at a disadvantage if you do not speak the second language?" This question was, of course, used in Volume I, but the intention here is simply to look once more at the functional value assigned to the second language. Question 28 is more specific, wanting to know whether the respondent in actual fact finds the second language a *better* means of communication, not only a useful means of communication. Question 29 is included to serve as an extention of question 28, defining the situations under which the second language is most likely to serve as a better instrument: when discussing work, when angry, or when relaxing. Of these three situations, the first implies a highly *functional* motivation, whereas the other two are more *social* in nature, though they cannot be defined more closely than that. The remaining two questions (27 and 40) were set to define emotional reactions to the second language.

They ask whether the respondent would like to be taken as a mother-tongue speaker of L2 (i.e. whether he would like to be accepted within the other language group) and whether he uses the language to impress people (i.e. whether the language has prestige for him). They refer, in reality, to two wholly different aspects. In a sense the latter question (40) is also concerned with functional value, but is evaluative and functional on another psychological plane. It is concerned with social prestige accorded to an ability to speak that particular language.

Lambert's term, *integrative motivation*, has been used before in this chapter, and basically it means this: the respondent values the other culture as highly or most probably higher than his own, and the desire to speak the language with the same proficiency as the native-speaker, points to a desire to associate himself with that culture *via* the other language. Question 27 attempts to describe attitudes in this respect. Obviously, to test this hypothesis completely it would be desirable to compare the results of these questions with some form of test for ethnic attitudes (preferably the Semantic Differential or an adaption of it). While such a test has been constructed by another institute of the Human Sciences Research Council, the data were not available at the time of writing. For the time being then, both the questions will be considered simply as measures to determine some of the reasons why respondents at times prefer speaking L2, or at least prove themselves willing to speak it. Later on, at the end of this chapter greater attention will be given to the individual qualities of these motivations.

3.3 RESULTS

3.3.1 Language identity and motivations for speaking L2

Quite briefly the results may be summarized as follows:

TABLE 3/1*

MOTIVATIONS FOR SPEAKING L2 BY LANGUAGE

	Afrikaners	ESSAs
	%	%
At a disadvantage without L2	82,7	76,7
Expresses himself better in L2 - often	13,9	4,9
(often & occasionally)	(55,4)	30,9
Would NOT like to be taken as native speaker of L2	36,1	13,8
(Yes, would)	(16,1)	(20,6)
Speaks L2 to impress people often	14,3	11,6
(often & occasionally)	(48,4)	(40,6)

As noted in Volume 1, both language groups feel that there is a definite need for both English and Afrikaans in their daily lives, although the Afrikaners feel rather more strongly about the need. So both groups feel generally that their particular second language does have a functional value. If this idea is taken further, and one considers the personal value the second language has for the respondent, as an instrument of communication in preference to the first language, the position is the same. Although the total percentages are very much smaller, the Afrikaner is now far more prepared to admit that he at times finds English better than his first language as a means of expressing his thoughts. This finding is highly significant, as a $\times 2$ test applied to Table B/1 shows. (It is in fact significant at the 1% level). Should the number of respondents who indicate that they only occasionally find the second language better be included, the difference between the two groups becomes even greater, more than half the Afrikaners answering in the affirmative, in contrast to less than a third of the ESSAs.

Of course, an indication that one occasionally finds that one can express oneself better in another language, may mean a number of things. It could simply mean that one finds using "carburettor" more natural than "*vergasser*", or "steak" rather than "*biefstuk*", if one were an Afrikaner. Conversely, "I'll *donder* your", "*dankie*" of "he's a nice *ou*" are expressive colloquialisms which many ESSAs may employ in certain circumstances. This type of thing is strictly speaking not the type of preference sought for by question 28. The examples above are more a matter of language pollution (or enrichment, depending on one's point of view) than functional employment of the second language *in preference to* the first language. Nevertheless, a number of respondents no doubt responded to the question although they are language "polluters" rather

*Based on Tables A/1, B/1, C/1 and D/1 respectively

than language "betrayers" (to anticipate the terminology used by the "language loyalists", to be discussed in Volume 4.) This type of misunderstanding will no doubt be most frequent among those who chose the *occasionally* option.

Secondly, and even more importantly, responses to this question are based on a general assessment of the whole range of social contact to which the respondent is daily exposed. The decision whether to use one or the other language is largely determined by the nature of the particular social contact situation which applies at a given moment, as shown in the previous sections to this chapter. In other words, people may find the second language a more viable communication instrument in certain situations than in others.

It is for this reason that question 29 was included in the questionnaire. The respondents were asked to indicate when they find it easier to express themselves in the second language, and they were given three options to choose from: when explaining something in connection with their work, when excited or angry, when enjoying themselves in the company of others. The results were, briefly, as follows. (The table represents the number of respondents as a percentage of the total who indicated that they find they can express themselves better in the second language).

TABLE 3.2

CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER WHICH RESPONDENTS FIND IT EASIER TO USE L2

	Afrikaners	ESSAs
At work	70,1	23,3
When angry	29,1	28,6
When enjoying themselves	52,4	41,4

The difference in motivation towards speaking the second language is nowhere more succinctly illustrated than in this table. It is immediately clear that English is a functional instrument to the Afrikaner, 70,1 per cent of those who answered *yes* to question 28 indicating their work as the area in which they find English useful. In the case of the ESSAs, the situation is reversed, the smallest percentage of ESSAs indicating work, and 41,4 per cent indicating relaxation and enjoyment as the sphere in which they most often find use for Afrikaans.

Of course, it must be remembered that this table's data cannot be said to apply to the whole sample, since only a percentage of the sample indicated that they find the second language a primary instrument for communication. Nevertheless,

there are indications here that, as second language, Afrikaans has a largely social/elective appeal, whereas English has a strong functional/compulsory appeal, besides a great deal of social appeal (52,4 per cent of the Afrikaners indicated *enjoyment* as well).

Question 40 adds to this picture by indicating that for both groups the second language has a certain amount of prestige value. In fact, should those who only occasionally use the second language to impress people be added, the number is remarkably high, considering the rather embarrassing nature of the question:

"Do you sometimes speak Afrikaans to Afrikaans-speaking people in order to make a good impression?"

The Afrikaners, however, are significantly more than the ESSAs (an x2 test on Table D/1 shows it to be significant at the 1 per cent level), indicating that the prestige attached to an ability to speak the second language is higher among the Afrikaners than the ESSAs.

Finally, linked to this is question 27, which was intended to find out to what extent the respondent would like to be associated with the other group. Reading as follows: "Would you like people to believe that you were Afrikaans-speaking when in Afrikaans company?", this question unfortunately lends itself to another interpretation as well. It could also simply indicate a norm of excellence the respondent sets himself in his speech. In view of the findings, and of previous data, the second interpretation seems to be the most likely one followed by the respondents, since the former would imply an attitude of betrayal perhaps too serious to contemplate.

Whatever the situation, the results here are particularly interesting because of a remarkably strong reaction from the Afrikaners. The reason may partly lie in the subtle difference in phrasing between the Afrikaans and English versions of the question. While they are basically similar, the Afrikaans version has the addition of *"heeltemal 'n Engelstalige"* ("*wholly* an English speaker"). This might place more accent on the idea of being assimilated by the other group and thus on language betrayal. In fact, this incomparability of the questions seems to have led to the basic ambiguity of the question being differently accentuated by the two language groups.

As it is 36,1 per cent of the Afrikaners have indicated that they would *not* like to be taken for native speakers of the second language, whereas only 13,8 per cent of the ESSAs indicated the same. While there are no great differences between the Afrikaners and ESSAs in the number of positive answers, the ESSAs do evince more interest in being taken for native speakers of Afrikaans. However, a most important point is also raised by the fact that 65,7 per

cent of the ESSAs are indifferent to the whole issue, while there is markedly more interest (positive and negative) among Afrikaners, only 47,8 per cent being indifferent.

It would appear then that the Afrikaner, because of the slant of the Afrikaans version of the question, feels that to indicate a desire to be taken for an English-speaking person, would indict him of a desire to identify with the other language group. The ESSA, on the other hand, appears to see the question as norm-determining rather than an assessment of language loyalty, largely one supposes because of the slighter emphasis placed on the cultural and political vulnerability of English. The ESSAs, therefore, are largely indifferent to the situation sketched in the question.

However, in a way, the finding that more ESSAs than Afrikaners would like to be accepted as Afrikaans-speaking, points to a fact noticed before (e.g. Volume 1 and section 2.2.4 of this Volume): The ESSAs show themselves much more insecure regarding their use of the second language, a fact which could be related to their desire to be accepted as Afrikaans-speaking. In other words, the insecurity may be caused by the high norms the ESSAs set for themselves regarding the use of Afrikaans on social occasions. At least the two factors may be related.

3.3.2 Sex differences

Sex differences also reveal an interesting pattern of norms, the men generally indicating more of a need for L2 and holding an ability to speak it in higher esteem. However the patterns for men and women differ for the two language groups.

TABLE 3.3*

MOTIVATIONS FOR SPEAKING L2, BY LANGUAGE AND SEX

	Afrikaner		ESSA	
	Men %	Women %	Men %	Women %
At a disadvantage without L2	84,8	81,0	77,4	76,3
Expresses himself better in L2 - often	17,2	11,4	5.1	4,9
(often & occasionally)	(63,0)	(49,7)	(32,6)	(29,6)
Would NOT like to be taken for L2 speaker	40,0	33,0	11,1	15,3
(yes, would)	(11,8)	(18,9)	(20,2)	(20,2)
Speaks L2 to impress people-	18,7	10,7	14,4	9,4
(often & occasionally)	(52,5)	(45,1)	(50,4)	(33,0)

While the differences between the responses of Afrikaner men and women are great in all the cases, the differences between the responses of ESSA men and

*Based on Tables A/1, B/1, C/1 and D/1

women are slight in most cases except for the question of prestige attached to speaking the second language. (Here, incidently, Afrikaner men and ESSA men agree quite closely).

In fact, from this table it would appear that it is particularly the Afrikaner men who attach great value to the second language and find it most useful.

On the other hand, it is also the Afrikaner men who are most resolutely set against the idea of being taken for a mother-tongue speaker of L2. Not only do two-fifths of them absolutely reject the idea, but only one-eighth of them would like it, in contrast to one-fifth of all the other groups, including Afrikaner women.

In short, it would seem that the Afrikaner men play more of a leading role in determining the attitudes of the group, than is the case with the ESSA men. There is also a marked difference with regard to the type of motivation found among the Afrikaner men, and among the other groups. Table 3.4 will illustrate:

TABLE 3.4*

CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER WHICH RESPONDENTS FIND IT EASIER TO USE L2

	Afrikaner		ESSA	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
At work	79,6	55,9	26,7	19,9
When angry	20,9	58,4	23,3	33,3
When enjoying themselves	43,3	61,1	39,4	42,9

Obvious from the table is that the Afrikaner man finds his strongest need for the second language as a medium of expression and communication when dealing with matters relating to his occupation. More than four-fifths of the Afrikaner men who feel they can sometimes express themselves better in the second language, selected this option. By contrast, all the other groups, including the Afrikaner women, selected the option *enjoyment* ("when enjoying yourself in the company of others"). In fact, there is a remarkable correspondence among the three remaining groups, the ESSA women only giving little more weight to *anger* option, the other two to the *work* option as second choice.

In order then it would seem that the Afrikaner men are primarily motivated by functional/instrumental considerations, Afrikaner women and ESSA men by both social and functional considerations, and ESSA women, if motivated to use the second language, do so primarily because of social considerations.

3.3.3 Age differences

As found in the two previous chapters, age differences do not exert an undue effect on Afrikaner attitudes. Table 3.5 provides the data for the two language groups.

*Number of respondents given as a percentage of the total who indicated they find they can express themselves better in L2

TABLE 3.5*

MOTIVATIONS FOR SPEAKING L2.BY LANGUAGE AND AGE

	AFRIKANERS				
	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55+
At a disadvantage without L2	86,9	87,5	85,2	84,0	75,3
Expresses himself better in L2-often	11,9	11,2	13,4	15,3	19,2
(often & occasionally)	(59,7)	(51,5)	(60,2)	(56,5)	(50,3)
Would NOT like to be taken for L2	25,0	31,9	36,0	42,8	45,2
speaker (yes, would)	(24,2)	(21,1)	(13,6)	(13,3)	(7,5)
Speaks L2 to impress people - often	16,0	11,9	15,6	16,4	12,4
(often & occasionally)	(58,0)	(48,0)	(49,3)	(44,9)	(44,1)
	ESSAS				
	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55+
At a disadvantage without L2	76,9	74,7	81,0	80,9	77,5
Expresses himself better in L2 - often	6,2	5,9	8,1	3,7	2,3
(often & occasionally)	(30,9)	(33,5)	(39,0)	(29,4)	(24,6)
Would NOT like to be taken for L2	16,7	11,9	8,4	13,2	17,1
speaker (yes, would)	(17,7)	(19,9)	(25,2)	(12,5)	(26,5)
Speaks L2 to impress people - often	10,5	14,0	16,8	7,7	9,6
(often & occasionally)	(47,3)	(45,3)	(43,7)	(32,3)	(36,5)

However, there is an interesting ambiguity in their response to the first two questions. While there is a slight lessening of the reaction to the question on the need for the second language, (with a considerable drop in the 55+ category alone), there is a marked *increase* in the number of Afrikaners who find English a better instrument for communication at times, when viewed accross the age groups. Starting with a mere 11,9 per cent in the 18-24 group, it builds up to a remarkable 19,2 per cent in the 55+ group who indicate that they *often* find this to be the case. When the *occasionally* option is added (percentages in brackets), this increase with age disappears, the highest percentages being found in the 35-44 and the 18-24 groups. The differences are not as dramatic however, although large.

So contrary to what one has been led to expect by the language loyalists, although they are aware of the need for the second language, the younger groups have less need of it as a preferred means of communication. Of course, this finding has a strong historical base, the younger Afrikaner no doubt having a wider Afrikaans technical vocabulary, a more widely distributed acceptance of Afrikaans as a viable means of business transaction, a socially more accepted language at his disposal.

*Based on Tables A/2, B/2, C/2 and D/2.

On the other hand the 18-24 group of Afrikaners do seem to have a strong emotional attachment to English, for 24,5 per cent of them would like to be taken for English-speaking people when in such company, and 58 per cent of them feel that the ability to speak English is prestigious. Both these latter attitudes gradually decrease with age. Particularly remarkable is the high resistance to being accepted as English-speaking evinced by the older groups, 45,2 per cent of the 55+ group saying *no* and a mere 7,5 per cent saying *yes*. With Afrikaners, there is a constant *indifferent* group ("it doesn't matter to me") of about 50 per cent.

Whether the above finding is a historical development, or a matter of maturity is at present impossible to say.

As for the type of motivation for speaking the language, Table E/2 (Appendix II) reveals that the 35-44 group is strongest on functional motivation (71,5 per cent) followed by the 35-34 and 45-54 groups (10 per cent lower) and then by the youngest and oldest groups (another 7-10 per cent lower). This pattern is clearly related to the fact that the years 35-54 are the most active occupational years. Because of the strong functional influence traced with Afrikaner men in the previous section (3.3.2), a more detailed look at this finding is needed. Table 3.6 looks at motivations according to language, sex and age groups.

TABLE 3.6

THE SPHERES IN WHICH RESPONDENTS FIND IT EASIER TO USE L2 . BY LANGUAGE, SEX AND AGE

	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55+
Afrikaner men	20	48	67	46	30
Work	64,5	84,2	100,0	83,6	69,8
	4	16	6	7	8
Anger	12,9	28,1	9,0	12,7	18,6
	16	17	18	15	25
Enjoyment	51,6	29,8	26,9	27,3	58,1
TOTAL	31	57	67	55	43
Afrikaner women	24	26	26	14	10
Work	49,0	41,3	41,3	34,2	30,3
	14	18	17	11	6
Anger	28,6	28,6	27,0	26,8	18,2
	24	33	34	20	24
Enjoyment	49,0	52,4	54,0	48,8	72,7
TOTAL	49	63	63	41	33

TABLE 3.6 (CONTINUED)

THE SPHERES IN WHICH RESPONDENTS FIND IT EASIER TO USE L2 . BY LANGUAGE, SEX AND AGE

	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55+
ESSA men	17	10	6	5	8
Work	50,0	45,5	26,1	41,7	30,8
	9	8	7	2	4
Anger	64,3	36,4	30,4	16,7	15,4
	6	8	15	8	19
Enjoyment	42,9	36,4	65,2	66,7	73,1
TOTAL	14	22	23	12	26
ESSA women	5	5	3	10	3
Work	31,3	17,2	12,0	35,7	17,7
	10	17	12	6	3
Anger	62,5	58,6	48,0	21,4	17,7
	11	15	17	17	9
Enjoyment	68,8	51,7	68,0	60,7	52,9
TOTAL	16	29	25	28	17

As can be seen, this pattern according to which the economically most active groups are the most obviously functional in their desire to speak L2, is highly dominant among Afrikaner men. In contrast the younger and older groups of Afrikaner men are correspondingly more socially motivated, although the functional motivations always remain the strongest.

In the case of the Afrikaner women the emphasis is more on the social aspect, although the functional remains a strong factor, particularly in the younger groups. This can, of course, be related to the fact that in the earlier years there are more women working, and that many drop out after marriage, thus finding the second language of more social than functional value.

With the ESSA groups this table has to be interpreted with great care since the totals are very small. Table E/2 indicates that the ESSA respondents are initially (18-34) most likely to find Afrikaans preferable when very excited or angry, although also for social purposes. Later on (35+) the stress falls mainly on social occasions. Table 3.6 indicates that this pattern is basically the same for ESSA men and women, although the younger group of men (18-34) does seem to find the functional aspects of Afrikaans valuable as well.

It would be interesting to find out what use is made of Afrikaans in moments of excitement or anger. Does this imply the use of swear words, words of abuse, and emotive language?

To return to Table 3.5, in the light of these results. The pattern found among the ESSA respondents is less straightforward than that found among the Afrikaners. The strongest feelings about the need for Afrikaans is found among the

middle group (35-44) and the following group (45-54) with the lower responses on either side. The same middle group also feels that it *often* (8,1 per cent) expresses its thoughts better in the second language. The same holds true when the *occasionally* option is added. The 35-44 group further confirms its positive attitude towards Afrikaans by indicating that they would like to be taken for speakers of the second language (25,2 per cent) and often speak the second language to impress other people (16,8 per cent).

The most strongly set against Afrikaans is apparently once again the 55+ group. While a large number of them see the need for L2 (77,5 per cent, in fact more than their Afrikaner counterparts), a mere 2,3 per cent actually say they often find it a better means of communication. Also a mere 9,6 per cent often use the language in order to impress someone (although in this they are outdone by the 45-54 group with 7,7 per cent. They also react quite sharply to the idea of being taken as a speaker of the other language, 17,1 per cent saying *no*, 26,5 per cent saying *yes*. The high percentage of *yes* responses, along with the relatively low *indifferent* response (56,4 per cent) is particularly interesting, as a possible explanation for the low self-evaluation of proficiency found among the 55+ group*. One could hypothesize that the group might set itself too high standards, thus not considering itself able to speak the language well enough, and refraining from speaking it, unless they can speak it like a native. However this hypothesis cannot really be maintained, since the 35-44 group also expresses the same wish, and *not* the same anti-reaction, while they are of the most bilingual groups. More research is needed on the whole question of self-evaluational tendencies and personal standards set by the various language groups.

At any rate, the basic ambiguity of this question is amply illustrated by these data.

Finally Table 3.5 indicates that the 18-24 group ESSAs (School-leaving and adults-in-the-making) are relatively positive in their attitudes as far as these questions are concerned, being more middle-of-the-road than anything else. Only in two aspects are they somewhat noteworthy. First of all, there is quite a strong reaction against being identified with the other group, although not nearly as strong as that found among Afrikaners of the same age. Secondly, should the *occasional* option also be taken into account, 47,3 per cent of them feel that a degree of prestige attaches to being able to speak Afrikaans. Should this be a tendency which has developed historically, becoming stronger over the past number of decades, it could be of great value for the recognition of Afrikaans as a major cultural force in South African society as a whole, not only among Afrikaners themselves. This is particularly important

*Cf. the suggestion made in 3.3.1.

if one bears in mind that such prestige has a strong hold on the middle group (35-44) where 16,8 per cent, more than even any Afrikaner group, said that they *often* employ their second language in order to impress someone. What makes this finding so potentially valuable is the fact that, while a similar attitude has long existed (and at times been lamented) among Afrikaners, it has not been commonly accepted as existing among ESSAs. Now it would seem that an appreciation of the prestige attached to speaking the other language, of being bilingual, exists among both language groups, and in the same pattern. The Afrikaner is still more aware of it, in all the age groups, but the awareness is strong among ESSAs as well.

3.3.4 Bilinguality

Table 3.7 studies the relation between bilinguality and motivations for speaking L2.

TABLE 3.7*

MOTIVATIONS FOR SPEAKING L2.BY LANGUAGE AND BILINGUALITY

	Afrikaners				ESSAs			
	Good	Fair	Weak	Not**	Good	Fair	Weak	Not
At a disadvantage without L2	89,8	85,6	75,7	33,3	84,9	79,7	76,8	71,3
Expresses himself better in L2 - often	24,9	7,6	3,4	0,0	20,3	2,0	0,9	0,0
(Often & occasionally)	(75,7	(51,5)	(25,8)	(0,0)	(68,3)	(36,0)	(12,9)	(0,0)
Would NOT like to be taken as L2	35,8	33,3	43,4	66,7	4,7	8,9	16,4	44,7
(*Yes*, would)	(10,1)	(18,1)	(25,7)	(33,3)	(28,1)	(20,1)	(16,8)	(25,5)
Speaks L2 to impress people - often:(often & occasionally)	19,6	11,0	1,0	0,0	21,8	16,4	3,9	2,2
	(53,6)	(48,3)	(32,4)	(0,0)	(41,9)	(52,9)	(37,0)	(2,2)
TOTAL (possible number)	320	319	153	4	128	214	237	50

Bilinguality is directly related to expressed opinions on the need for L2. Thus, the greater the degree of bilinguality of the respondents, the more frequent the belief that one is at a disadvantage if one does not speak L2, and the more likely the respondent is to feel that he can express himself better in L2. This holds true for both language groups.

*Based on Tables A/4, B/4, C/4 and D/4

**N here is too small for significance to be attached to results

Proficiency in L2 also influences - or is influenced by - the prestige attached to L2. Among Afrikaners the relationship is much the same as the foregoing: the greater the degree of bilinguality, the more respondents indicate that they often (or occasionally) employ English in order to impress people. Should only the *often* group of ESSAs be considered the same pattern is found, although when the *occasionally* option is added, the pattern changes. The *fair* and *poor* groups are now much more willing to admit such practices, particularly the *fair* group, of which more than half indicate that they employ Afrikaans in this way.

The greatest difference between the language groups is found with respect to question 27. Among the Afrikaners there is a marked increase in apathy concerning the desire to be taken for an L2 speaker while both *yes* responses and *no* responses decrease as one moves up the bilinguality scale. Thus the strongest feelings about this form of identification is found among those respondents who judge themselves as *weak* in English. The decrease in the desire to be accepted as English-speaking in particular is of interest; for it is the opposite of the pattern found among the ESSAs. There, while reaction against such identification also decreases, as among the Afrikaners, the desire to be identified with Afrikaans increases sharply with increase in bilinguality. Thus it is the *good* group of ESSAs, but the *weak* group of Afrikaners who are most in favour of being taken for L2 speakers.

The reason for this basic difference in attitude between Afrikaner and ESSA may be ascribable to another basic difference, namely their attitudes towards language loyalty (cf. 3.3.1 and Volume 4). Also a possible factor is the existence of two distinct criteria for language proficiency. The Afrikaner may see a desire for identification as a betrayal of language loyalty (thus the high general *no* response) and consider proficiency as unrelated to acceptance by and as L2 speaker (thus the low *yes* response, among the *good* group who have experience). The employment of acceptance by L2 speakers as a criterium for excellence in L2 would, however, be more common in this case among those who are weak themselves and have less experience of contact situations. Awareness of *correctness* in language usage, and a consciousness of *language loyalty* as a refuge when forced to speak L2, would also be more likely among the weak group than the good group. So one finds the Afrikaner pattern appearing.

Among ESSAs a different pattern and possibly a different criterion exists. The concept of language loyalty is not as well known or valued among ESSAs as among Afrikaners (cf. Volume 4), so few ESSAs - barring the idiosyncratic *NOT* group - are definitely set against being taken for L2 speakers. On the other hand greater proficiency brings greater desire for acceptance as L2

speaker, possibly because the criterion for excellence in L2 among ESSAs is acceptance by the other language group.

As for the fifty respondents who cannot speak Afrikaans, they exhibit strong polarization on this question. The wish to be taken as L2 speaker is strongly supported, but even stronger is the reaction against it. This ambiguity is indicative to two likely factors responsible for the unilinguality of the respondents, namely too high standards which they set for themselves and an antipathy to Afrikaans itself or towards speakers of Afrikaans.

3.3.5 Socio-economic status

Higher socio-economic status has thus far proved to be indicative of a generally more positive attitude towards the second language, but the differences between the status groups are small in what follows, as illustrated by Table 3.8.

TABLE 3.8*

MOTIVATIONS FOR SPEAKING L2 BY LANGUAGE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

	Afrikaners			ESSAs		
	Upper	Middle	Lower	Upper	Middle	Lower
At a disadvantage without L2	88,0	84,3	79,1	80,4	77,1	70,7
Expresses himself better in L2 - often	12,8	15,6	13,0	4,9	5,6	7,2
(often & occasionally)	(61,4)	(56,6)	(48,9)	(31,3)	(32,6)	(31,9)
Would NOT like to be taken as L2	36,6	36,0	36,8	10,8	15,0	10,2
(*yes*, would)	(14,8)	(16,0)	(15,9)	(22,0)	(18,9)	(14,3)
Speaks L2 to impress people - often	13,3	15,5	14,6	11,7	12,1	14,3
(often & occasionally)	(53,1)	(49,5)	(44,8)	(42,2)	(38,7)	(41,8)
TOTAL (possible number)	246	330	227	247	230	99

While the differences between the responses of the three status groups are significant among the Afrikaner group, and the relatively stable pattern that occurs there is thus meaningful, the differences in the ESSA group are not significant at all, except for question 38. For example an X2 test applied to Table B/3 shows that the differences are significant only at the 98 per cent level. And the differences in the other questions are no greater than these. Hence socio-economic status has little influence on ESSA responses to question 38, 27 and 40. In other words, motivations for speaking

*Based on Tables A/3, B/3, C/3 and D/3

L2 differ very little from one status group to the other, despite the fact that the upper classes feel a greater need for Afrikaans than do the lower classes.

Among Afrikaners the pattern is somewhat clearer and socio-economic status does appear to exercise some differentiating influence on responses to the questions under discussion. Interesting is the fact that, should one consider only the *often* responses, the middle-class Afrikaners find English a more viable means of communication, and attach greater prestige to it. However, the differences are very small. Should the *occasionally* option also be taken into consideration, a more significant pattern is revealed. The higher the status group now, the more respondents indicate that they at times express themselves better in English and speak English in order to impress other people. Otherwise stated, English appears to have a greater functional and prestige value for the upper classes than for the lower class. While not always equally significant (the X2 test shows significance at the 5 per cent and 30 per cent levels respectively for questions 27 and 40) the general pattern holds good.

On only one issue are all the Afrikaners unanimous: their antipathy to being taken for L2 speakers. Because of the conditioned nature of Afrikaners attitudes towards language betrayal (cf. Volume 4), this is wholly expected.

3.3.6 Language milieu

Language milieu has a fairly consistent influence on the responses to the questions under discussion. In fact, for all three measures - language background, language experience, and language environment - a simple formula holds up quite well: the extent of L2 contact is directly related to the degree of need, extent to which the respondent feels able to express himself better, and the prestige attached to L2. The more contact, particularly early and more intimate contact, the greater the value placed on L2 as functional language, communication instrument and token of prestige. This pattern is true of both language groups, as Tables 3.9 - 3.11 prove (pp.37, 38 and 40.)

Obviously this is a very generalized formula and a number of minor differences do occur. Basically it holds good for Tables 3.9 and 3.10, except for a slight deviation when one finds that of those ESSA respondents who had L2 contact up to 18 years (i.e. those with early exposure to Afrikaans) have little need of Afrikaans, even less so than the group with no contact. This phenomenon is most likely less significant than it appears, for the total N for that group of the ESSAs is 28. Nevertheless, there is a tendency, among Afrikaners as well, for this group and the *no contact* group (4) to be found close together, suggesting that early exposure has less influence on an

TABLE 3/9*

MOTIVATIONS FOR SPEAKING L2. BY LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE BACKGROUND

Language Background	Home language was L1 but often spoke L2 outside	Home language was L1 but occasionally spoke L2 outside	Home language was L1 and never spoke L2 outside	Home language was both L1 and L2 and often spoke L2 outside	Home language was both L1 and L2 and occasionally spoke L2 outside	Home language was L2 and often spoke L2 outside
Afrikaners						
At a disadvantage without L2	88,2	85,3	75,9	89,5	72,7	66,6
Expresses himself better in L2-often	24,3	7,4	4,0	30,8	10,0	33,3
(Often + occasionally)	(71,4)	(46,6)	(33,1)	(92,3)	(60,0)	(100,0)
Would <u>not</u> like to be taken as L2	33,5	35,6	50,3	25,0	27,2	0.0
(<u>Yes</u>, would)	(9,9)	(21,0)	(16,1)	(12,5	(36,3)	(0,0)
Speaks L2 to impress people - often	15,7	13,9	9,2	34,2	9,0	0,0
(Often + occasionally)	(50,6)	(50,5)	(35,4)	(73,7)	(54,5)	(0,0)
Total possible N	264	337	153	40	11**	3**
ESSAs						
At a disadvantage without L2	90,9	78,1	70,5	78,1	69,3	82,5
Expresses himself better in L2-often	6,4	1,5	0,7	19,5	7,7	25,0
(Often + occasionally)	(51,0)	(21,9)	(7,8)	(75,6)	(46,2)	(67,5)
Would <u>not</u> like to be taken as L2	4,5	15,5	27,3	2,4	0,0	2,5
(<u>Yes</u>, would)	(27,0)	(16,5)	(13,3)	(31,7)	(15,4)	(40,0)
Speaks L2 to impress people - often	18,4	6,9	2,6	29,3	15,4	21,1
(Often + occasionally)	(50,5)	(45,2)	(23,0)	(46,3)	(61,6)	(34,3)
Total possible N	111	197	158	41	13**	41

* Based on Tables A/5, B/5, C/5 and D/5

** N to small for significance to be attached to results

TABLE 3/10*

MOTIVATIONS FOR SPEAKING L2.BY LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE EXPERIENCE

Had L2 Contact	AFRIKANER				ESSA			
	Whole period	Up to 18	18+	Never	Whole period	Up to 18	18+	Never
At a disadvantage without L2	88,4	77,1	81,9	68,7	82,6	55,5	74,7	68,9
Expresses himself better in L2 - often	17,4	16,3	7,7	0,0	7,0	3,7	1,1	0,0
(Often + occasionally)	(63,1)	(59,2)	(50,0)	(10,0)	(43,0)	(18,5)	(12,7)	(1,3)
Would not like to be taken as L2	31,5	47,0	45,4	52,0	7,4	19,2	24,7	28,8
(Yes, would)	(16,5)	(8,1)	(16,9)	(23,0)	(23,4)	(19,2)	(11,8)	(17,8)
Speaks L2 to impress people - often	15,7	16,7	15,1	0,0	16,5	0,0	2,4	1,4
(Often + occasionally)	(52,3)	(39,6)	(43,9)	(23,9)	(48,7)	(23,1)	(36,5)	(9,5)
Total possible N	483	49	78	50	383	28	87	78

*Based on Tables A/6, B/6, C/6 and D/6.

awareness of the need for L2 than later or lifelong contact (cf. Volume 1). Otherwise *language background* points to the great influence a bilingual home background (groups 4 and 6 in particular) has on these attitudes. Likewise, *language experience* points to the influence of long exposure to L2 (group 1) on the same attitudes. Both findings are facets of the same factor.

Language environment differentiates much less clearly between these attitudes, except for the fact that those respondents who have no present contact with L2 are much less aware of a need for L2, find it less useful as a means of communication and assign exceedingly less significance to the ability to speak it.

Small as the differences between the various other forms of language environment are, the two tendencies already isolated in Volume 2, namely the *extent of the contact* (often/occasionally have such conversations) and the *quality of the contact* (casual/serious conversations), do appear in Table 4.11 as well. Among Afrikaners the extent of contact (*often* versus *occasionally*) is the distinguishing quality in questions 38 and 28. The more frequent the contact, the greater is the need felt and the communicative value of English. On the other hand, in question 40, the quality of the contact seems more important. Thus those respondents who indicated that they have serious conversations (occasionally or often) also evince a greater awareness of the prestige value of an ability to speak English. Possibly an ability to conduct a serious conversation in English is of greater prestige value than the ability to carry on a light and casual conversation.

On the other hand, the pattern is exactly inverted among the ESSAs. The quality of the contact is determinant in question 38 and 28, while the extent of the contact is more important in question 40. This factor is perhaps best illustrative of the basic difference in motivation that exists between the two language groups, a difference not easily defined by means of the questions discussed here. A much finer measuring instrument is called for.

As for the wish to be taken for a speaker of L2, the various language milieu variables also have a common tendency. The greater the contact, the less the resistance of the Afrikaners to being taken as L2, but also the less interest in being taken as such. Thus, with greater contact, early, later or current, the sense of apathy - "it does not matter to me" - grows. Among ESSAs, the greater the contact, the less the resistance, but the greater the wish to be taken as L2.

TABLE 3/11*

MOTIVATIONS FOR SPEAKING L2. BY LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE ENVIRONMENT (FORMS 1 - 6**)

Extent of L2 Contact	AFRIKANER						ESSA					
	Never have contact with L2	Occasionally have casual conversations in L2	Occasionally have casual and serious conversations in L2	Often have casual conversations in L2	Often have casual and occasionally serious conversations in L2	Often have casual and serious conversations in L2	Never have contact with L2	Occasionally have casual conversations in L2	Occasionally have casual and serious conversations in L2	Often have casual conversations in L2	Often have casual and occasionally serious conversations in L2	Often have casual and serious conversations in L2
At a disadvantage without L2	58,3	81,4	82,2	87,8	91,9	93,8	66,7	75,2	90,9	74,4	86,3	87,0
Expresses himself better in L2-often (often and occasionally)	6,0 (22,9)	1,9 (32,3)	7,4 (52,6)	10,3 (58,5)	12,1 (71,6)	32,3 (80,0)	0,8 (4,7)	1,1 (20,4)	4,6 (37,6)	2,5 (12,5)	3,9 (49,0)	16,6 (60,5)
Would not like to be taken as L2 (Yes, would)	54,8 (14,3)	32,9 (19,9)	35,6 (16,4)	29,3 (22,4)	28,3 (17,6)	30,6 (14,0)	34,1 (15,5)	11,2 (13,0)	5,7 (29,6)	12,5 (15,0)	7,8 (19,6)	5,7 (30,0)
Speaks L2 to impress people-often (often and occasionally)	7,5 (23,8)	7,0 (43,9)	11,9 (53,2)	17,9 (44,7)	16,2 (59,4)	25,8 (55,3)	2,4 (15,9)	4,8 (45,2)	10,6 (41,2)	15,4 (56,4)	26,0 (56,0)	25,7 (49,2)
Total possible N	84	163	148	58	74	195	131	171	88	40	52	140

* Based on Tables A/7, B/7, C/7 and D/7

** Forms 7 - 9, being rare, have been left out. Cf. 1.2.3

In other words, the prestige attached to being able to speak L2 in such a way as to pass for a native speaker grows with contact as far as the ESSA is concerned, but diminishes in the case of the Afrikaner as contact increases. Why this should be so is not clear from the data at hand, but is no doubt related to the differential effect contact with L2 has on Afrikaners and ESSAs, as noticed above. It is also strongly influenced by the difference in feeling occasioned by the sense of language betrayal contained in the question as set, as pointed out before (3.3.1).

3.3.7 Regional differences

Linked to the question of language milieu, we have the regional differences as represented by four urban areas Pretoria, Johannesburg, Bloemfontein and Cape Town. Table 3.12 presents the relevant data.

TABLE 3.12*

MOTIVATIONS FOR SPEAKING L2 BY LANGUAGE AND AREA WHERE RESIDENT

	Afrikaners				ESSAs			
	PTA	JHB	BFN	CAPE	PTA	JHB	BFN	CAPE
At a disadvantage without L2	83,8	85,3	82,3	86,7	75,0	79,3	81,3	79,5
Expresses himself better in L2 - Often	10,8	17,4	13,1	16,9	9,4	4,7	18,8	2,7
(often & occasionally)	(51,6)	(54,2)	(57,3)	(58,5)	(56,3)	(26,3)	(50,0)	(28,7)
Would NOT like to be taken as L2	38,0	37,8	40,3	34,1	19,4	5,4	18,8	15,3
(*yes*, would)	(20,3)	(9,6)	(12,9)	(12,5)	(22,6)	(21,6)	(25,0)	(21,3)
Speaks L2 to impress people - often	11,0	18,3	11,3	12,5	13,3	9,6	18,8	21,3
(often & occasionally)	(43,5)	(49,7)	(51,6)	(65,9)	(33,3)	(37,1)	(43,8)	(84,6)
TOTAL (possible number)	160	157	64	91	32	171	16**	151
Language colour of city (% Afrikaans-speaking)	77,6	31,6	80,6	35,2	77,6	31,6	80,6	35,2

The differences between the responses in most of the cases listed in Table 3.12 are too small to indicate significant differences in attitude between respondents from the various cities. However, there is a slight indication that a respondent in a predominantly L2 city would be more likely to find L2 of value. This pattern is most generally evident when one looks at the *often* responses. The clearest example of this pattern, however, is

* Based on Tables A/8, B/8, C/8, and D/8

** N less than 20. No real statistical significance may be attached to these results.

found in the *occasionally* responses to question 28 among the ESSAs. Twice as many respondents in Afrikaans-predominant cities, as in English dominated cities, indicate that they find Afrikaans a better means of communication at times. While this same pattern also appears from questions 38 to 40, for both Afrikaners and ESSAs, it is never again as clear. But, notwithstanding the reservations occasioned by the small differences, the strong influence of the social structure and language conventions of a particular city is amply evident.

As for the response to question 27, the strongest Afrikaner reaction against being taken for an L2 speaker occurs in the three northern cities, respondents in the Cape being slightly less concerned. However the strongest support for such identification occurs in Pretoria, the least in Johannesburg. Again this could be ascribable to the fact that the Johannesburg Afrikaner has much more contact with English than his Pretoria counterpart, a causal relationship traced before in 3.3.6.

With the ESSAs reaction against this identification is strongest in the predominantly Afrikaans cities, but by far the weakest in Johannesburg. Then again apathy, a "couldn't-care-less" attitude, is particularly high in Johannesburg (73%).

3.4 CONCLUSION

Studying the effect of social distances and role relationships on willingness to speak L2, this volume has revealed important differences in attitude among Afrikaners and ESSAs.

Firstly, the Afrikaner is normally more willing than the ESSA to employ L2, but only in situations outside his family circle. The ESSA, on the other hand, apparently feels more secure using L2 with intimates and therefore is more willing than the Afrikaner to do so in family circles.

Secondly, whereas the Afrikaner is likely to employ L2 in all role-relations, except with servant, the ESSA reacts differentially. He is more likely to speak L2 to a social inferior, and more probably because of functional or adaptive (accomodative) considerations than other social reasons (e.g. prestige or integrative tendencies).

All of which points to fundamental differences in motivation that obtain for Afrikaners and ESSAs.

Section 3.2 of this report then dealt with some of the motivations behind a willingness, and indeed alacrity at times, to speak L2 (other motivations having been noted before, in Volume 2).

Basically three types of motivation are tentatively studied: functional motivation, reference group attraction (i.e. Lambert's "integrative motivation") and reference language status (i.e. prestige which L2 has, cf. Labov, 1966). While to study these motivations in detail would require the use of a battery of specifically designed attitude scales, the questions employed do give a few pointers if interpreted with care.

It appears that functional reasons ("I need English") and prestige of English are important motivations where the Afrikaner is concerned, whereas the ESSA finds Afrikaans of little practical use, but socially relatively valuable. However, the Afrikaner reacts strongly - either positively or negatively - to being taken for an English speaker, whereas the ESSA is little concerned about this factor. Thus integrative motivation is not a simple yes/no matter in South Africa, since it involves a specific set of anti-integrative values among the Afrikaners (cf. Section 4 to follow, also Volume 4).

These patterns are basically true of all the variables, only being more accentuated by greater bilinguality and greater contact with L2. And above all, these motivations are seldom found working alone. They rather form part of a greater motivational pattern, where the various types of motivation interact upon one another to produce a certain behavioural reaction in a specific contact situation.

Section 4 will now add a few more factors in this motivational matrix, and Volume 4 will then pay some attention to the extreme whereto these motivational tendencies could lead: language shift.

4 MOTIVATIONS BEHIND BILINGUAL LANGUAGE BEHAVIOUR AMONG WHITE SOUTH AFRICANS : A HYPOTHESIS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Quite briefly, two conclusions may be said to summarise the findings of this survey up to this point (i.e. after 3 reports):

(a) The Afrikaner is more positively oriented towards using and being proficient in L2 than his ESSA compatriot, although both groups in principle agree to bilingualism and the value of a secong language.

(b) The two factors, besides language identity, which correlate most highly with positive language attitudes are: bilinguality and language milieu (i.e. extent of L2 contact at various stages in life). Precisely how they influence respondents differs for the two language groups, thus being indicative of different motivations involved. Furthermore, the causal relationship between language proficiency, language milieu and

language attitudes is not clear from the data at hand.

Such are the basic findings. One more aspect, the possible motivations behind specific language behaviour and particularly possible language shift, deserves some further comment.

In the foregoing sections of this report some attention has been paid to certain possible motivations for language behaviour in contact situations between speakers of different languages. The motivational factors were provisionally identified as 'functional motivation', 'reference group attraction' and 'reference language status'.

In order to provide a more fundamental reference framework in this respect, and possibly point out avenues for further research, it may be well to end this Volume with a brief description of a hypothesis concerning language behaviour in contact situations. The hypothesis reads:

"Choice of the language of communication in a contact situation between bilinguals* is determined in part by one or more of four basic motivational variables in the individual speaker, namely *reference group attraction, reference language status, functional (instrumental) motivation* and *adaptive behaviour.*"

4.2 DISCUSSION

In a paper read at the University of Rhodesia, December 1975, L.W. Lanham postulated three social forces that serve as main motivations for initial linguistic behaviour which produces variation in idiolects and diversity in the speech community. They are:

(a) Reference group attraction (the pursuit of social aspirations and a desired social identity)

(b) Peer group conformity (the response to coercion - in the special case when (a) and (b) do not act in concert)

(c) Accommodation (seeking empathy and reducing social distance).

His concern was with the variations of English (RP, conservative SAE and extreme SAE) employed in South Africa.

While these social forces are not quite effective in their present form for explaining linguistic behaviour regarding the use of L1 and L2, and language

*In terms of Afrikaans and English, among White adults only

shift tendencies, they are important in pointing out the kind of factors which might apply.

Throughout the course of the survey described above, (1.2 ff.) similar factors were noted and tested. There are four which eventually proved most valuable when attempting to explain the reactions of South Africans to contact situations with L2. They are: reference group attraction, reference language status, functional or instrumental motivation and adaptive behaviour.

(i) Reference group attraction, like Lanham's term, implies the pursuit of social aspirations and a social identity associated with speakers of the target language. In effect this is W.E. Lambert's integrative motivation*, which he describes in educational terms as being a wish to learn more about the other cultural community because of an open-minded interest in that community - to the point of eventually being accepted as a member of that community. As mentioned before, Lambert finds this kind of motivation the most effective in language learning. In terms of motivation for language choice in a contact situation, this kind of orientation is most likely to lead to a preference for speaking the second language, and even possibly language and cultural shift. It therefore has both a positive value for language learning and a negative value for general cultural homogeneity. A student motivated in this way by a reference group attraction is, on the one hand, more likely to learn the other language quickly and correctly, but he will, on the other hand, be much more likely to discard his own cultural identity in favour of the new. Socially this kind of motivation is normally disapproved of and even condemned.** Sociologically it is allied to ethnocentricism, attitudes towards the speakers of the language influencing attitudes towards the language itself.

An interesting tendency of this kind was brought to the researcher's attention by a fellow researcher who had been testing out a questionnaire for use among the peoples of South West Africa. When he asked a testee what his reasons were for preferring a certain local language, the response was "to make a good marriage". In other words, the desire to move up the social ladder by means of a suitable marriage served as motivation for learning the language in question. In this way the language had value for him as a means of attaining membership of a target group - thus reference group attraction.

Obviously this factor can also function negatively. The individual could have an aversion to the other language group and this would very

*Gardner and Lambert, 1959
**Cf. Volume 4 for further discussion in this respect

likely lead to an aversion to learning that group's language. In this way too orientation towards the other culture may affect language learning and language use. South African history provides ample examples of people who are unwilling to use the language of the conqueror. So too anyone who has taught L2 in a predominantly L1 area will know of the problems which may arise.

Exceptions can occur though, and therefore there is a second group here.

(ii) A second possible factor may be called *reference language status*. Aspects of a similar factor have been clearly identified by Labov in his study in New York City (1966). He found that certain New York dialects were more prestigious than others. This too may apply to a language: it may have greater social (and functional) value, or cultural status, and thus the ability to speak it would itself become a status factor for the respondent. There is no coercion involved, L2 having gained a positive niche in the respondent's value system. What differentiates this factor from (i), is that the objective is not the L2 socio-cultural group, but L2 itself, for the value it has within the respondent's own socio-cultural group.

This factor is a significant one in South Africa and is often typified by the reference to English as an "international language".

Although this factor is often closely allied to reference group attraction, it can nevertheless be an independent factor. An individual can admire English (or German, or French) as an international language with specific cultural attributes and, therefore, desire to acquire the language as a token of cultural achievement. Yet at the same time, the individual does not necessarily have a desire to adopt the English (or German or French) culture.

This factor is most prevalent among Afrikaans-speaking Whites in South Africa. It is also emerging as a powerful factor among the Bantu peoples of S.A. and one which has tremendous educational implications in their schools and social development.* Reference language status is not socially ostracized motivation under normal circumstances, although it is often seen as a danger to the continued existence of Afrikaans. It leads more often to bilingualism, I believe, than language shift, but because of its close relation to *reference group attraction* the danger always exists that what was originally simply

*Cf. The survey of language attitudes among the Black peoples of the Republic of South Africa, a report of which has just been published by the Division for Sociolinguistics of the Human Sciences Research Council. (G.K. Schuring, 1977)

admiration for the second language may develop into admiration for the culture of the second-language speaker.

K.P. Prinsloo, (1972) in the pilot study of this survey studied a type of motivation he named *emotional* motivation and included two questions to elicit the feelings of his sample of students about this. He asked whether they felt the second language to be a "nicer" language to speak, and whether it was "more pleasant" to listen to. He found that of the Afrikaans students 10 per cent felt English to be a nicer language to speak and 28 per cent felt it to be more pleasant to hear. The per= centages for the English students were 3 per cent and 2 per cent res= pectively.

In this study respondents were asked whether they at times express them= selves better in L2*, but this lies somewhat closer to the next factor.

These feelings are particularly strong among students of literature and other arts, those who feel that English is more expressive than Afri= kaans, or that it opens the world to a greater world of knowledge. The *emotional* orientation described by Prinsloo is, of course, somewhat further advanced towards a rejection of the first language than is the more functional preference of one who simply feels the language opens more gates to him than does his first language.

In language courses this type of motivation is often sought through lectures on the literary achievements of the language in question, in an attempt to activate interest in learning the language. Latin, as a cultural token, has existed for a great many years on its mere reputa= tion as high cultural qualification.

(iii) A third factor is functional value. It implies the adoption or use of L2 for purely functional reasons, where needs prove stronger than any de= mands - positive or negative - made by the value system. In a sense this is Gardner and Lambert's "instrumental motivation", where the emo= tional concern with L2 is minimal, functional concern maximal.

Quite simply it means that the individual *needs* the second language - to get along in his job, to read a book, to pass an examination, to transact personal business at the Post Office, the greengrocer or the bank, to speak to his neighbour, to date a girl. Under such circumstances he will learn the language, if he does not know it, or speak it if he does. It depends on how strong the need is. And it may even take place although he is negatively orientated towards the particular group. Obviously the

*Cf. 3.3 of the present report

result will be a severe internal struggle and the eventual outcome is highly upredictable in many cases.

In South Africa, as in most bilingual countries, the incidence of situations which could be construed as exercising social pressure is quite high. As noted before, most of the respondents in our survey indicated that they do at times come into contact with second language speakers. However the pressure to use a particular language will vary from place to place and form situation to situation.

Theoretically it ought to be possible to live in South Africa - where bilingualism is obligatory in most public sectors - without knowing the second language. A number of people have done so, but by and large the majority of South Africans do occasionally require the use of the second language, if only to read a notice while on holiday.

Socially this form of motivation is the most common and most accepted, for it does not imply any conscious disloyalty to one's first language. Educationally, however, its effectiveness is perhaps not as great as that of the first two factors named, unless it is reinforced by some strong incentive - more pay for example, or ability to do better business.

(iv) The last factor operates least of all in a language learning situation, but is, I believe, of primary importance in language contact situations. Lanham first suggested the concept of accommodation, or response matching, as a possible explanation for language shift phenomena as found in the survey. However his term, as outlined in his 1975 paper, applies more specifically to "accommodative linguistic behaviour in monolingual situations, where the dissimilarities between interlocutors are little more than social dialect differences". And he believes that such accommodation takes place downward - That is a person will accommodate down, but not up.
The data dealt with in this survey patently did not qualify in these terms, since language shift presumes a bilingual situation, where dissimilarities between the interlocutors are based on differences in language identity. Nor does the accommodation, or response matching, (in the sense of a language choice for conversation) necessarily take place downwards in these cases. On the contrary, it very often takes place upwards. A bilingual brought into contact with a speaker of L1 will under most circumstances use L1 as well, irrespective of the other person's social position. In the case of two bilinguals the choice of language will be dictated by a number of situational factors, of which the relative role relations of the interlocutors may be one. However, the way in which such role relations affect one may differ from speaker

to speaker.

In section 2 of this report it was attempted to study the effect of role relations on language choice in a contact situation. Although the findings are, generally speaking, hampered by certain methodological problems, certain tendencies are yet revealed. In the pilot study by K.P. Prinsloo (1972) it was found that the English-speaking student was more willing to speak the second language to his social inferior, than his fellow student at an Afrikaans university. In the study of language loyalty described in section 2, much the same trend is revealed, at least for the upper and middle socio-economic classes. In both cases role relations seem to have little effect on the willingness of the Afrikaans-speaking individual to speak English.

Because of these differences in interpretation between Lanham's concept and bilingual behaviour, it is best to employ a different term, namely *adaptive behaviour*, to indicate *a tendency to seek empathy and reduce social distance by adopting the other person's language and thus to adapt to the situation.* This tendency is closely related to, and often indistinguishable from, the previous factor, but it is voluntary and unaffected by external circumstances. Unaccompanied by any of the other factors named, this is unlikely to lead to any serious language shift or attempts to learn the second language, but it does to a large extent govern language choice in a contact situation.

The accommodative tendency, as Lanham also pointed out, is a normal human reaction to social contact. In the case of language the adaptive behaviour or *response matching* - as an attempt to empathize - may take place at various levels and in various forms.

On the one hand, one may select a particular language in which to carry on a conversation (in order to ease the situation, promote communication, to flatter or condescend to the other speaker, etc.), on the other one may choose to speak in a certain dialectal form (e.g. use the student language to seem "one of the boys") or use a simplified form of speech in order to allow for the other person's inability to understand more technical language (as in speaking to children or servants). So too one may attempt to "elevate" one's language in order to provide the other person with what one thinks he may expect. This often happens outside a classroom when teacher and pupil meet: the teacher simplifies his language, even using slang to minimise the social difference, while the pupil attempts to use very correct, very formal language. Our present interest is in the first of these forms. It may at times be seen simply as a tendency to "be polite", to consider the other man's rights. This

happens most often when a fluent bilingual is addressed in one of his two languages. Normal good manners thus require that he respond in the same language. Or else his willingness to adapt may cause him to do so.

This can also work negatively, of course, and he could refuse to do so. Naturally communication will break down completely then.

But what occurs when two bilingual speakers with different language identities meet - what language will they speak?

A great number of factors will, of course, be of influence, but important among them will be the willingness of the one speaker to speak the language of the other. However, should one speaker refuse to switch to L2, communication can yet continue - unless he has affronted the other speaker by his refusal.

This willingness to adapt has often been criticised, particularly in speakers of Afrikaans*, but is a necessary factor in human communication. It is also likely that this tendency is more than any other dependent variable, easily influenced by any or all of the other factors. For example, a bilingual individual, involved in a contact situation with a speaker of his second language, could be led in his willingness to adapt to the situation by his attitude towards the other language group, his emotional feelings about the other language, as well as the needs of the situation (i.e. the subject under discussion, the role-relations that apply, etc.).

4.3 CONCLUSION

All four of these social forces are common to man in society, and how they function will depend primarily on the social aspects of both the individual and the contact situation. It is important to realize that these factors are interrelated and function at various levels of intensity, within a wide and complex social framework.

It is something of this complexity that was glimpsed in the foregoing study, and perhaps the most significant finding may yet be that too little is known about these factors which to such a large extent rule not only our day-to-day communications, but the very texture of our society as a whole.

Even if the data provided by this survey were only to serve as a starting-point in a more complete study of the factors affecting language learning and language use in South Africa, it will have served its purpose.

---

*A point to be raised again in the final Volume in this series (No. 4.).

APPENDIX 1

THE SURVEY SAMPLE (N = 1 607)

		N	%
1.	The language groups		
	Afrikaans-speaking	918	57,1
	English-speaking	689	42,9
2.	Sex		
	Male	703	43,8
	Female	904	56,3
3.	Marital State		
	Married	1 230	76,5
	Unmarried	242	15,1
	Divorced	37	2,3
	Widow/Widower	95	5,9
4.	Age		
	18-24	234	14,6
	25-34	387	24,1
	35-44	342	21,3
	45-54	311	19,4
	55-64	217	13,5
	65 and more	116	7,2
5.	Occupation		
	Retired, student, housewife	639	39,8
	Professional, technical	215	13,4
	Administrative	44	2,7
	Clerical	330	20,5
	Sales	127	7,9
	Mines	14	0,9
	Transport and communication	16	1,0
	Artisans	169	10,5
	Services	48	3,0
	Unknown	5	0,3

	N	%
6. Income		
Less than R2 000	98	6,9
R2 000 - R3 000	156	11,0
R3 000 - R4 000	189	13,3
R4 000 - R5 000	193	13,6
R5 000 - R6 000	173	12,2
R6 000 - R7 000	170	12,0
R7 000 - R8 000	117	8,2
R8 000 - R9 000	85	6,0
R9 000 - R10 000	68	4,8
R10 000 - R11 000	43	3,0
R11 000 - R12 000	44	3,1
R12 000 - R14 000	35	2,5
R14 000 - R16 000	16	1,1
R16 000 - R18 000	7	0,5
R18 000 and more	26	1,8

APPENDIX III

THE TABLES

TABLE A/1* RESPONDENTS WHO FEEL THEY PLACE THEMSELVES AT A DISADVANTAGE WITHOUT L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND SEX

	by sex						by language						Afrikaners					ESSAS				
	M		F		Total		Afr.		ESSA		Total		M		F		Total	M		F		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	N	%	N	%	N
Yes definitely																						
N	415	47,3	463	52,7	878	100	525	59,8	353	40,2	878	100	256	48,8	269	51,2	525	159	45,0	194	55,0	353
%	59,0		51,2		54,6		57,2		51,2		54,6		63,1		52,5		57,2	53,5		49,5		51,2
Yes it could be																						
N	159	38,8	251	61,2	410	100	234	57,1	176	42,9	410	100	88	37,6	146	62,4	234	71	40,3	105	59,7	176
%	22,6		27,8		25,5		25,5		25,5		25,5		21,7		28,5		15,5	23,9		26,8		25,5
No not really																						
N	87	38,7	138	61,3	225	100	101	44,9	124	55,1	225	100	37	36,6	64	63,4	101	50	40,3	74	59,7	124
%	12,4		15,3		14,0		11,0		18,0		14,0		9,1		12,5		11,0	16,8		18,9		18,0
No definitely not																						
N	29	43,9	37	56,1	66	100	42	63,6	24	36,4	66	100	17	40,5	25	59,5	42	12	50,0	12	50,0	24
%	4,1		4,1		4,1		4,6		3,5		4,1		4,2		4,9		4,6	4,0		3,1		3,5
Blanks N	13	46,4	15	53,6	28	100	16	57,1	12	42,9	28	100	8	50,0	8	50,0	16	5	41,7	7	58,3	12
%	1,8		1,7		1,7		1,7		1,7		1,7		2,0		1,6		1,7	1,7		1,8		1,7
TOTAL N	703	43,7	904	56,3	1607	100	918	57,1	689	42,9	1607	100	406	44,2	512	55,8	918	297	43,1	392	56,9	689
%	100		100		100		100		100		100		100		100		100	100		100		100

* Blanks are taken into account in this Table.

TABLE A/2 RESPONDENTS WHO THINK THEY PLACE THEMSELVES AT A DISADVANTAGE WITHOUT L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND AGE

Age		AFRIKANERS												ESSAS											
		18-24		25-34		35-44		45-54		55+		Total		18-24		25-34		35-44		45-54		55+		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes definitely	N	80	15,3	141	27,0	128	24,5	93	17,8	81	15,5	523	100	39	11,0	79	22,4	69	19,5	74	21,0	92	26,1	353	100
	%	61,5		60,5		59,3		55,0		54,0		58,2		41,1		52,7		57,0		54,4		53,2		52,3	
Yes, could be	N	33	14,2	63	27,0	56	24,0	49	21,0	32	13,7	233	100	34	19,5	33	19,0	29	16,7	36	20,7	42	24,1	174	100
	%	25,4		27,0		25,9		29,0		21,3		25,9		35,8		22,0		24,0		26,5		24,3		25,8	
No not really	N	13	13,0	22	22,0	22	22,0	18	18,0	25	25,0	100	100	21	16,9	33	26,6	20	16,1	20	16,1	30	24,2	124	100
	%	10,0		9,4		10,2		10,7		16,7		11,1		22,1		22,0		16,5		14,7		17,3		18,4	
No definitely not	N	4	9,5	7	16,7	10	23,8	9	21,4	12	28,6	42	100	1	4,2	5	20,8	3	12,5	6	25,0	9	37,5	24	100
	%	3,1		3,0		4,6		5,3		8,0		4,7		1,1		3,3		2,5		4,4		5,2		3,6	
Total	N	130	14,5	233	25,9	216	24,1	169	18,8	150	16,7	898	100	95	14,1	150	22,2	121	17,9	136	20,1	173	25,6	675	100
	%	100		100		100		100		100		100		100		100		100		100		100		100	

TABLE A/3 RESPONDENTS WHO FEEL THEY PLACE THEMSELVES AT A DISADVANTAGE WITHOUT L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Status		AFRIKANERS				ESSAS			
		Upper	Middle	Lower	Total	Upper	Middle	Lower	Total
Yes definitely	N	150	195	116	461	138	112	47	297
	%	61,7	60,0	52,7	58,5	56,3	49,3	47,5	52,0
Yes, could be	N	64	79	58	201	59	63	23	145
	%	26,3	24,3	26,4	25,5	24,1	27,8	23,2	25,4
Not really	N	20	34	31	85	41	44	25	110
	%	8,2	10,5	14,1	10,8	16,7	19,4	25,3	19,3
Definitely not	N	9	17	15	41	7	8	4	19
	%	3,7	5,2	6,8	5,2	2,9	3,5	4,0	3,3
Total	N	243	325	220	788	245	227	99	571
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE A/4 RESPONDENTS WHO FEEL THEY PLACE THEMSELVES AT A DISADVANTAGE WITHOUT L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND BILINGUALITY

	AFRIKANERS					ESSAS				
Bilinguality	Good	Fair	Weak	Cannot speak L_2	Total	Good	Fair	Weak	Cannot speak L_2	Total
Yes definitely N	232	179	52	0	463	90	120	97	22	329
%	74,1	56,3	34,2	0,0	58,9	71,4	56,9	41,6	44,8	53,2
Yes could be N	49	93	63	1	206	17	48	82	13	160
%	15,7	29,3	41,5	33,3	26,2	13,5	22,8	35,2	26,5	25,9
No, not really N	22	36	29	0	87	17	39	44	10	110
%	7,0	11,3	19,1	0,0	11,1	13,5	18,5	18,9	20,4	17,8
Definitely not N	10	10	8	2	30	2	4	10	4	20
%	3,2	3,1	5,3	66,7	3,8	1,6	1,9	4,3	8,2	3,2
Total N	313	318	152	3	786	126	211	233	49	619
%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE A/5 RESPONDENTS WHO FEEL THEY PLACE THEMSELVES AT A DISADVANTAGE WITHOUT L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE BACKGROUND

		AFRIKANERS							ESSAS						
Language at home Frequency L_2 spoken		L_1 Often	L_1 Occasional	L_1 Never	$L_1 + L_2$ Often	$L_1 + L_2$ Occasional	L_2 Often	Total	L_1 Often	L_1 Occasional	L_1 Never	$L_1 + L_2$ Often	$L_1 + L_2$ Occasional	L_2 Often	Total
Yes, definitely	N	186	177	67	25	7	1	6	7	98	64	28	6	23	291
	%	71,3	54,3	45,0	65,8	63,6	33,3	58,8	66,1	51,0	41,0	68,3	46,2	57,5	52,8
Yes, could be	N	44	101	46	9	1	1	202	27	52	6	4	3	10	1
	%	16,9	31,0	30,9	23,7	9,1	33,3	25,6	24,8	27,1	29,5	9,8	23,1	25,0	25,8
Not really	N	23	35	25	2	3	1	89	7	1	32	6	4	6	9
	%	8,8	10,7	16,8	5,3	27,3	33,3	11,3	6,4	21,4	20,5	14,6	30,8	15,0	17,4
Definitely not	N	8	13	11	2	0	0	34	3	1	1	3	0	1	22
	%	3,1	4,0	7,4	5,3	0,0	0,0	4,3	2,8	0,5	9,0	7,3	0,0	2,5	4,0
Total	N	261	326	149	8	11	3	788	109	192	156	1	1	0	551
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE A/6 RESPONDENTS WHO FEEL THEY PLACE THEMSELVES AT A DISADVANTAGE WITHOUT L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE EXPERIENCE

		AFRIKANERS					ESSAS				
Had L_2 Contact		Whole pe= riod	Up to 18 years	From 18 years	Never	Total	Whole pe= riod	Up to 18 years	From 18 years	Never	Total
Yes, definitely	N	302	25	39	17	383	229	9	39	27	304
	%	63,7	52,1	50,7	35,4	59,2	60,6	33,3	44,8	35,1	53,4
Yes, could be	N	117	12	24	16	169	83	6	26	26	141
	%	24,7	25,0	31,2	33,3	26,1	22,0	22,2	29,9	33,8	24,8
Not really	N	42	7	11	11	71	59	12	18	15	104
	%	8,9	14,6	14,3	22,9	11,0	15,6	44,4	20,7	19,5	18,3
Definitely not	N	13	4	3	4	24	7	0	4	9	20
	%	2,7	8,3	3,9	8,3	3,7	1,9	0,0	4,6	11,7	3,5
Total	N	474	48	77	48	647	378	27	87	77	569
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE A/7 RESPONDENTS WHO FEEL THEY PLACE THEMSELVES AT A DISADVANTAGE WITHOUT L_2, BY LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE ENVIRONMENT (I.E. CURRENT CONTACT WITH L_2)

AFRIKANERS

Type of contact and Frequency of contact		Never	Casual Occasional	Casual and serious Occasional	Casual Often	Casual often and serious occasional	Casual and serious Often	Serious Occasional	Serious Often	Casual occasional and serious often	Total
Yes definitely	N	27	61	81	36	59	159	1	2	22	448
	%	32,1	37,9	55,5	63,2	79,7	82,4	20,0	50,0	64,7	59,1
Yes could be	N	22	70	39	14	9	22	3	1	9	189
	%	26,2	43,5	26,7	24,6	12,2	11,4	60,0	25,0	26,5	24,9
Not really	N	26	22	21	5	5	8	1	0	1	89
	%	31,0	13,7	14,4	8,8	6,8	4,2	20,0	0,0	2,9	11,7
Definitely not	N	9	8	5	2	1	4	0	1	2	32
	%	10,7	5,0	3,4	3,5	1,4	2,1	0,0	25,0	5,9	4,2
Total	N	84	161	146	57	74	193	5	4	34	758
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

ESSAS

Yes definitely	N	44	76	57	17	35	96	1	1	7	334
	%	34,9	45,0	64,8	43,6	68,6	69,6	50,0	100,0	53,9	53,3
Yes could be	N	40	51	23	12	9	24	0	0	4	163
	%	31,8	30,2	26,1	30,8	17,7	17,4	0,0	0,0	30,8	26,0
Not really	N	29	39	8	9	6	18	1	0	2	112
	%	23,0	23,0	9,1	23,0	11,8	13,0	50,0	0,0	15,4	17,9
Definitely not	N	13	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	18
	%	10,3	1,8	0,0	2,6	2,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	0,0	2,9
Total	N	126	169	88	39	51	138	2	1	13	627
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE A/8 RESPONDENTS WHO FEEL THEY PLACE THEMSELVES AT A DISADVANTAGE WITHOUT L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND PLACE OF RESIDENCE

		AFRIKANERS								ESSAS							
Place of Residence		Pre= toria	Vaal Tri= angle	Johan= nesburg	Bloem= fontein	Natal	Eastern Cape	Cape Town	Total	Pre= toria	Vaal Tri= angle	Johan= nesburg	Bloem= fontein	Natal	Eastern Cape	Cape Town	Total
Yes definitely	N	87	32	102	35	12	38	52	358	20	4	88	7	51	36	75	281
	%	56,1	51,6	65,4	56,5	100,0	67,9	57,8	60,4	62,5	57,1	52,1	43,8	48,6	46,2	51,4	50,8
Yes could be	N	43	15	31	16	0	10	26	141	4	2	46	6	30	21	41	150
	%	27,7	24,2	19,9	25,8	0,0	17,9	28,9	23,8	12,5	28,6	27,2	37,5	28,6	26,9	28,1	27,1
Not really	N	17	13	15	8	0	6	9	68	6	1	32	3	19	15	25	101
	%	11,0	21,0	9,6	12,9	0,0	10,7	10,0	11,5	18,8	14,3	18,9	18,8	18,1	19,2	17,1	18,3
Definitely not	N	8	2	8	3	0	2	3	26	2	0	3	0	5	6	5	21
	%	5,1	3,2	5,1	4,8	0,0	3,6	3,3	4,4	6,3	0,0	1,8	0,0	4,8	7,7	3,4	3,8
Total	N	155	62	156	62	12	56	90	593	32	7	169	16	105	78	146	553
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE B/1 THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO FEEL THEY SOMETIMES EXPRESS THEMSELVES BETTER IN L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND SEX

		Sex			Language			Language and sex					
								Afrikaner			ESSA		
		M	F	Total	Afrikaner	ESSA	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total
Yes, often	N	84	76	160	126	34	160	69	57	126	15	19	34
	%	12,1	8,5	10,1	13,9	4,9	10,0	17,2	11,4	13,9	5,1	4,9	5,0
Yes, occasionally	N	266	288	554	376	178	554	184	192	376	82	96	178
	%	38,2	32,4	34,9	41,5	26,0	34,9	45,8	38,3	41,6	27,5	24,7	26,1
No, never	N	347	526	873	402	471	873	149	253	402	198	273	471
	%	49,8	59,1	55,0	44,4	68,9	55,0	37,1	50,4	44,5	67,1	70,4	69,0
Total	N	697	890	1587	904	683	1587	402	502	904	295	388	683
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE B/2 THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO FEEL THEY SOMETIMES EXPRESS THEMSELVES BETTER IN L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND AGE

Language		Afrikaners						ESSA					
Age		18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55+	Total	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55+	Total
Yes, often	N	16	26	29	26	29	126	6	9	10	5	4	34
	%	11,9	11,2	13,4	15,3	19,2	13,9	6,2	5,9	8,1	3,7	2,3	5,0
Yes, occasionally	N	64	94	101	70	47	376	24	42	38	35	39	178
	%	47,8	40,3	46,8	41,2	31,1	41,6	24,7	27,6	30,9	25,7	22,3	26,1
No, never	N	54	113	86	74	75	402	67	101	75	96	132	471
	%	40,3	48,5	39,8	43,5	49,7	44,5	69,1	66,5	61,0	70,6	75,4	69,0
Total	N	134	233	216	170	151	904	97	152	123	136	175	683
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE B/3 THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO FEEL THEY SOMETIMES EXPRESS THEMSELVES BETTER IN L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Language		Afrikaners				ESSAS			
Class		Upper	Middle	Lower	Total	Upper	Middle	Lower	Total
Yes, often	N	31	51	29	111	12	13	7	32
	%	12,8	15,6	13,0	14,0	4,9	5,6	7,2	5,6
Yes, occasionally	N	118	134	80	332	65	62	24	151
	%	48,7	41,0	35,9	41,9	26,4	27,0	24,7	26,3
No, never	N	94	142	114	350	169	155	66	390
	%	38,7	43,4	51,1	44,1	68,7	67,3	68,0	68,0
Total	N	243	327	223	793	246	230	97	573
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE B/4 THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO FEEL THEY SOMETIMES EXPRESS THEMSELVES BETTER IN L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND BILING= UALITY

Language		Afrikaners					ESSAS				
Bilinguality		Good	Fair	Weak	Cannot speak L_2	Total	Good	Fair	Weak	Cannot speak L_2	Total
Yes, often	N	16	23	5	0	104	25	4	2	0	31
	%	24,9	7,6	3,4	0	13,7	20,3	1,9	0,9	0	5,1
Yes, occasionally	N	155	133	33	0	321	59	70	27	0	156
	%	50,8	43,9	22,4	0	42,2	48,0	34,1	12,0	0	26,0
No, never	N	74	147	109	4	334	39	131	196	48	414
	%	24,3	48,5	74,1	100,0	44,0	31,7	63,9	87,1	100,0	68,9
Total	N	305	303	147	4	759	123	205	225	48	601
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE B/5 THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO FEEL THEY SOMETIMES EXPRESS THEMSELVES BETTER IN L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE BACKGROUND

LANGUAGE BACKGROUND		Afrikaners							ESSAS						
		Home language was L_1 but often spoke L_2 outside	Home language was L_1 but occasionally spoke L_2 outside	Home language was L_1 and never spoke L_2 outside	Home language was both L_1 and L_2 and often spoke L_2 outside	Home language was both L_1 and L_2 and occasionally spoke L_2 outside	Home language was L_2 and often spoke L_2 outside	TOTAL	Home language was L_1 but often spoke L_2 outside	Home language was L_1 but occasionally spoke L_2 outside	Home language was L_1 and never spoke L_2 outside	Home language was both L_1 and L_2 and often spoke L_2 outside	Home language was both L_1 and L_2 and occasionally spoke L_2 outside	Home language was L_2 and often spoke L_2 outside	TOTAL
Yes, often	N	64	24	6	12	1	1	108	7	3	1	8	1	10	30
	%	24,3	7,4	4,0	30,8	10,0	33,3	13,7	6,4	1,5	0,7	19,5	7,7	25,0	5,4
Yes, occasionally	N	124	127	44	24	5	2	326	49	40	11	23	5	17	145
	%	47,1	39,2	29,1	61,5	50,0	66,7	41,3	44,6	20,4	7,1	56,1	38,5	42,5	26,1
No, never	N	75	173	101	3	4	0	356	54	153	143	10	7	13	380
	%	28,5	53,4	66,9	7,7	40,0	0	45,1	49,0	78,0	92,2	24,3	53,9	32,5	68,5
Total	N	263	324	151	39	10	3	790	110	196	155	41	13	40	555
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE B/6 THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO FEEL THEY SOMETIMES EXPRESS THEMSELVES BETTER IN L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND EXPERIENCE

Had L_2 contact		Afrikaners					ESSAS				
		Whole period	Up to 18 years	From 18 years	Never	Total	Whole period	Up to 18 years	From 18 years	Never	Total
Yes, often	N	83	8	6	0	97	27	1	1	0	29
	%	17,4	16,3	7,7	0	14,8	7,0	3,7	1,1	0	5,1
Yes, occasionally	N	218	21	33	5	277	137	4	10	1	152
	%	45,7	42,9	42,3	10,0	42,3	36,0	14,8	11,6	1,3	26,6
No, never	N	176	20	39	45	280	217	22	75	76	390
	%	36,9	40,1	50,0	90,0	42,8	57,0	81,5	87,2	98,7	68,3
Total	N	477	49	78	50	654	381	27	86	77	571
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE B/7 THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO FEEL THEY SOMETIMES EXPRESS THEMSELVES BETTER IN L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND ENVIRONMENT

Afrikaners		Never have contact with L_2	Occasionally have casual conversations in L_2	Occasionally have casual and serious conversations in L_2	Often have casual conversations in L_2	Often have casual and occasionally serious conversations in L_2	Often have casual and serious conversations in L_2	Occasionally have serious conversations in L_2	Often have serious conversations in L_2	Occasionally have casual and often serious conversations in L_2	TOTAL
Yes, often	N	5	3	11	6	9	63	0	0	11	108
	%	6,0	1,9	7,4	10,3	12,1	32,3	0,0	0,0	32,3	14,1
Yes, occasionally	N	14	49	67	28	44	93	2	2	19	318
	%	16,9	30,4	45,2	48,2	59,5	47,7	40,0	50,0	55,9	41,8
No, never	N	64	109	70	24	21	39	3	2	4	336
	%	77,1	67,7	47,3	41,3	28,4	20,0	60,0	50,0	11,8	44,0
Total	N	83	161	148	58	74	195	5	4	34	762
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE B/7 THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO FEEL THEY SOMETIMES EXPRESS THEMSELVES BETTER IN L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND ENVIRONMENT

ESSAS		Never have contact with L_2	Occasionally have casual conversations in L_2	Occasionally have casual and serious conversations in L_2	Often have casual conversations in L_2	Often have casual and occasionally serious conversations in L_2	Often have casual and serious conversations in L_2	Occasionally have serious conversations in L_2	Often have serious conversations in L_2	Occasionally have casual and often serious coversations in L_2	TOTAL
Yes, often	N	1	2	4	1	2	23	0	0	0	33
	%	0,8	1,1	4,6	2,5	3,9	16,6	0,0	0,0	0,0	5,2
Yes, occasionally	N	5	33	29	4	23	61	0	1	8	164
	%	3,9	19,3	33,0	10,0	45,1	43,9	0,0	100,0	61,5	25,9
No, never	N	123	136	55	35	26	55	2	0	5	437
	%	95,4	79,5	62,5	87,5	51,0	39,6	100,0	0,0	38,4	68,9
Total	N	129	171	88	40	51	139	2	1	13	634
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE B/8 THE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO FEEL THEY SOMETIMES EXPRESS THEMSELVES BETTER IN L_2 THAN L_1. BY LANGUAGE AND AREA OF RESIDENCE

Language and		Afrikaners							ESSAS						
Area of Resi=dence		Pretoria	Vaal Tri=angle	Johannes=burg	Bloemfon=tein	Natal	East Cape	Cape Town	Pretoria	Vaal Triangle	Johannes=burg	Bloemfon=tein	Natal	East Cape	Cape Town
Yes, often	N	17	4	27	8	6	12	15	3	0	8	3	4	6	4
	%	10,8	6,5	17,4	13,1	50,0	21,4	16,9	9,4	0,0	4,7	18,8	3,8	7,9	2,7
Yes, occasio=nally	N	64	30	57	27	5	20	37	15	3	37	5	15	20	39
	%	40,8	48,4	36,8	44,2	41,7	35,7	41,6	46,9	37,6	21,6	31,2	14,2	26,3	26,0
No, never	N	76	28	71	26	1	24	37	14	5	126	8	86	50	107
	%	48,4	45,1	45,8	42,6	8,3	42,9	41,6	43,8	62,5	73,7	50,0	82,0	65,8	71,3
Total	N	157	62	155	61	12	56	89	32	8	171	16	105	76	150
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE C/1 RESPONDENTS WHO WOULD LIKE PEOPLE TO BELIEVE THEY ARE NATIVE SPEAKERS O' L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND SEX

		Sex			Language			Language and Sex					
					Afrikaner	Essa	Total	Afrikaner			Essa		
		M	F	T				M	F	T	M	F	T
Would like it	N	108	176	284	145	139	284	48	97	145	60	79	139
	%	15,6	19,9	17,7	16,1	20,6	17,7	11,8	18,9	15,8	20,2	20,2	20,2
Doesn't matter	N	392	483	875	431	444	875	191	240	431	201	243	444
	%	56,7	54,6	54,4	47,8	65,7	54,4	47,0	46,9	46,9	67,7	62,0	64,4
Wouldn't like it	N	192	226	418	325	93	418	159	166	325	33	60	93
	%	27,8	25,5	26,0	36,1	13,8	26,0	40,0	33,0	35,4	11,1	15,3	13,5
Total	N	692	885	1577	901	676	1577	398	503	901	294	382	676
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE C/2 RESPONDENTS WHO WOULD LIKE PEOPLE TO BELIEVE THEY ARE NATIVE SPEAKERS OF L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND AGE

Language		Afrikaners						ESSAS					
Age		18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55+	Total	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55+	Total
Would like it	N	32	49	29	23	11	144	17	30	30	17	45	139
	%	24,2	21,1	13,6	13,3	7,5	16,1	17,7	19,9	25,2	12,5	26,5	20,7
Doesn't matter	N	67	109	108	76	69	429	63	103	79	101	96	442
	%	50,8	47,0	50,5	43,9	47,3	47,8	65,6	68,2	66,4	74,3	56,5	65,8
Wouldn't like it	N	33	74	77	74	66	324	16	18	10	18	29	91
	%	25,0	31,9	36,0	42,8	45,2	36,1	16,7	11,9	8,4	13,2	17,1	13,5
Total	N	132	232	214	173	146	897	96	151	119	136	170	672
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE C/3 RESPONDENTS WHO WOULD LIKE PEOPLE TO BELIEVE THEY ARE NATIVE SPEAKERS OF L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Language		Afrikaners				ESSAS			
Class		Upper	Middle	Lower	Total	Upper	Middle	Lower	Total
Would like it	N	36	52	35	123	53	43	14	110
	%	14,8	16,0	15,9	15,6	22,0	18,9	14,3	19,4
Doesn't matter	N	118	156	104	378	162	150	74	386
	%	48,6	48,0	47,2	48,0	67,2	66,0	75,5	68,2
Wouldn't like it	N	89	117	81	287	26	34	10	70
	%	36,6	36,0	36,8	36,4	10,8	15,0	10,2	12,4
Total	N	243	325	220	788	241	227	98	566
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE C/4 RESPONDENTS WHO WOULD LIKE PEOPLE TO BELIEVE THEY ARE NATIVE SPEAKERS OF L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND BILINGUALITY

Language		Afrikaners					ESSAS				
Bilinguality		Good	Fair	Weak	Cannot speak L_2	Total	Good	Fair	Weak	Cannot speak L_2	Total
Would like it	N	32	57	39	1	129	36	43	39	12	130
	%	10,1	18,1	25,7	33,3	16,4	28,1	20,0	16,8	25,5	20,9
Doesn't matter	N	171	153	47	0	371	86	152	155	14	407
	%	54,1	48,6	30,9	0,0	47,2	67,1	71,0	66,8	29,8	65,5
Wouldn't like it	N	113	105	66	2	286	6	19	38	21	84
	%	35,8	33,3	43,4	66,7	36,3	4,7	8,9	16,4	44,7	13,5
Total	N	316	315	152	3	786	128	214	232	47	621
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE C/5 RESPONDENTS WHO WOULD LIKE PEOPLE TO BELIEVE THAT THEY ARE NATIVE SPEAKERS OF L_2

Language Background		Afrikaners							ESSAS						
		Home language was L_1 but often spoke L_2 outside	Home language was L_1 but occasionally spoke L_2 outside	Home language was L_1 but never spoke L_2 outside	Home language was both L_1 and L_2 and often spoke L_2 outside	Home language was both L_1 and L_2 and occasionally spoke L_2 outside	Home language was L_2 and often spoke L_2 outside	TOTAL	Home language was L_1 but often spoke L_2 outside	Home language was L_1 but occasionally spoke L_2 outside	Home language was L_1 and never spoke L_2 outside	Home language was both L_1 and L_2 and often spoke L_2 outside	Home language was both L_1 and L_2 and occasionally spoke L_2 outside	Home language was L_1 and often spoke L_2 outside	TOTAL
Would like it	N	26	68	24	5	4	0	127	30	32	20	13	2	16	113
	%	9,9	21,0	16,1	12,5	36,3	0,0	16,1	27,0	16,5	13,3	31,7	15,4	40,0	20,6
Doesn't matter	N	149	140	50	25	4	3	371	76	132	89	27	11	23	358
	%	56,7	43,3	33,6	62,5	36,3	100,0	47,0	68,4	68,0	59,3	65,9	84,6	57,5	65,2
Wouldn't like it	N	88	115	75	10	3	0	291	5	30	41	1	0	1	78
	%	33,5	35,6	50,3	25,0	27,2	0,0	36,9	4,5	15,5	27,3	2,4	0,0	2,5	14,2
Total	N	263	323	149	40	11	3	789	111	194	150	41	13	40	549
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE C/6 RESPONDENTS WHO WOULD LIKE PEOPLE TO BELIEVE THEY ARE NATIVE SPEAKERS OF L_2 BY LANGUAGE AND EXPERIENCE

Language		Afrikaners					ESSAS				
Experience		Whole period	Up to 18 years	From 18 years	Never	Total	Whole period	Up to 18 years	From 18 years	Never	Total
Would like it	N	1	4	13	11	107	89	5	10	13	117
	%	16,5	8,1	16,9	23,0	16,4	23,4	19,2	11,8	17,8	20,7
Doesn't matter	N	249	22	29	12	312	264	16	54	39	373
	%	52,0	45,0	37,7	25,0	47,8	69,3	61,5	63,5	53,4	66,0
Wouldn't like it	N	151	23	35	25	234	28	5	21	21	75
	%	31,5	47,0	45,4	52,0	35,9	7,4	19,2	24,7	28,8	13,2
Total	N	479	49	77	48	653	381	26	85	73	565
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE C/7 RESPONDENTS WHO WOULD LIKE PEOPLE TO BELIEVE THEY ARE NATIVE SPEAKERS OF L_2 BY LANGUAGE AND ENVIRONMENT

Environment Afrikaners		Never have contact with L_2	Occasionally have casual conversations in L_2	Occasionally have casual and serious conversations in L_2	Often have casual conversations in L_2	Often have casual and occasionally serious conversations in L_2	Often have casual and serious conversations in L_2	Occasionally have serious conversations in L_2	Often have serious conversations in L_2	Occasionally have casual and often serious conversations in L_2	TOTAL
Would like it	N	12	32	24	13	13	27	1	0	4	126
	%	14,3	19,9	16,4	22,4	17,6	14,0	16,7	0,0	12,1	16,6
Doesn't matter	N	26	76	70	28	40	107	1	1	18	367
	%	31,0	47,2	48,0	48,2	54,0	55,4	16,7	25,0	54,5	48,4
Wouldn't like it	N	46	53	52	17	21	59	4	3	11	266
	%	54,8	32,9	35,6	29,3	28,3	30,6	66,7	75,0	33,3	35,1
Total	N	84	161	146	58	74	193	6	4	33	759
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE C/7 RESPONDENTS WHO WOULD LIKE PEOPLE TO BELIEVE THEY ARE NATIVE SPEAKERS OF L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND ENVIRONMENT

Environment ESSAS		Never have contact with L_2	Occasionally have casual conversations in L_2	Occasionally have casual and serious conversations in L_2	Often have casual conversations in L_2	Often have casual and occasionally serious conversations in L_2	Often have casual and serious conversations in L_2	Occasionally have serious conversations in L_2	Often have serious conversations in L_2	Occasionally have casual and often serious conversations in L_2	TOTAL
Would like it	N	19	22	26	6	10	42	0	0	2	127
	%	15,5	13,0	29,6	15,0	19,6	30,0	0,0	0,0	15,4	20,3
Doesn't matter	N	62	128	57	29	37	90	2	1	10	416
	%	50,4	75,7	64,8	72,5	72,6	64,2	100,0	100,0	77,0	66,4
Wouldn't like it	N	42	19	5	5	4	8	0	0	1	84
	%	34,1	11,2	5,7	12,5	7,8	5,7	0,0	0,0	7,7	13,4
Total	N	123	169	88	40	51	140	2	1	13	627
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE C/8 RESPONDENTS WHO WOULD LIKE PEOPLE TO BELIEVE THEY ARE NATIVE SPEAKERS OF L_2. BY LANGUAGE AND AREA OF RESIDENCE

Language		Afrikaners							ESSAS						
Area of Residence		Pretoria	Vaal Triangle	Johan= nesburg	Bloem= fontein	Natal	Eastern Cape	Cape Town	Pretoria	Vaal Triangle	Johan= nesburg	Bloem= fontein	Natal	Eastern Cape	Cape Town
Would like it	N	32	14	15	8	2	9	11	7	1	36	4	24	11	32
	%	20,3	22,6	9,6	12,9	16,7	16,7	12,5	22,6	12,5	21,6	25,0	23,1	14,3	21,3
Doesn't matter	N	66	28	82	29	9	29	47	18	6	122	9	60	54	95
	%	41,8	45,1	52,6	46,8	75,0	53,7	53,4	58,1	75,0	73,0	56,3	57,7	70,1	63,3
Wouldn't like it	N	60	20	59	25	1	16	30	6	1	9	3	20	12	23
	%	38,0	32,3	37,8	40,3	8,3	29,6	34,1	19,4	12,5	5,4	18,8	19,2	15,6	15,3
Total	N	158	62	156	62	12	54	88	31	8	167	16	104	77	150
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE D/1 RESPONDENTS WHO SOMETIMES SPEAK L_2 IN ORDER TO MAKE A GOOD IMPRESSION. BY LANGUAGE AND SEX

		Sex			Language			Language and sex					
					Afrikaner	ESSA	Total	Afrikaner			ESSA		
		M	F	Total				M	F	Total	M	F	Total
Yes, often	N	115	87	202	125	77	202	73	52	125	42	35	77
	%	16,8	10,1	13,1	14,3	11,6	13,1	18,7	10,7	14,3	14,4	9,4	11,6
Yes, occasionally	N	237	255	492	299	193	492	132	167	299	105	88	193
	%	34,6	29,7	31,9	34,1	29,0	31,9	33,8	34,4	34,1	36,0	23,6	29,0
No, never	N	331	516	847	452	395	847	186	266	452	145	250	395
	%	48,5	60,1	55,0	51,6	59,4	55,0	47,6	54,8	51,6	49,7	67,0	59,4
Total	N	683	858	1541	876	665	1541	391	485	876	292	373	665
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE D/2 RESPONDENTS WHO SOMETIMES SPEAK L_2 IN ORDER TO MAKE A GOOD IMPRESSION. BY LANGUAGE AND AGE

Language		Afrikaner						ESSAS					
Age		18-24	25-34	34-44	45-54	55+	Total	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55+	Total
Yes, often	N	21	27	32	27	18	125	10	21	20	10	16	77
	%	16,0	11,9	15,6	16,4	12,4	14,3	10,5	14,0	16,8	7,7	9,6	11,6
Yes, occasionally	N	55	82	69	47	46	299	35	47	32	32	45	191
	%	42,0	36,1	33.7	28,5	31,7	34,2	36,8	31,3	26,9	24,6	26,9	28,9
No, never	N	55	118	104	91	81	449	50	82	67	88	106	393
	%	42,0	52,0	50,7	55,2	55,9	51,4	52,6	54,7	56,3	67,7	63,5	59,5
Total	N	131	227	205	165	145	873	95	150	119	130	167	661
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE D/3 RESPONDENTS WHO SOMETIMES SPEAK L_2 IN ORDER TO MAKE A GOOD IMPRESSION. BY LANGUAGE AND CLASS

Language		Afrikaners				ESSAS			
Class		Upper	Middle	Lower	Total	Upper	Middle	Lower	Total
Yes, often	N	32	49	31	112	28	27	14	69
	%	13,3	15,5	14,8	14,6	11,7	12,1	14,3	12,3
Yes, occasionally	N	96	108	63	267	73	59	27	159
	%	39,8	34,0	30,0	34,8	30,5	26,6	27,5	28,4
No, never	N	113	160	116	389	138	136	57	331
	%	46,9	50,5	55,2	50,7	57,7	61,2	58,2	59,2
Total	N	241	317	210	768	239	222	98	559
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE D/4 RESPONDENTS WHO SOMETIMES SPEAK L_2 IN ORDER TO MAKE A GOOD IMPRESSION. BY LANGUAGE AND BILINGUALITY

Language		Afrikaners					ESSAS				
Bilinguality		Good	Fair	Weak	Cannot speak L_2	Total	Good	Fair	Weak	Cannot speak L_2	Total
Yes, often	N	60	34	9	0	103	27	34	9	1	71
	%	19,6	11,0	6,0	0,0	13,5	21,8	16,4	3,9	2,2	11,6
Yes, occasionally	N	104	115	39	0	258	25	76	77	0	178
	%	34,0	37,3	26,4	0,0	33,7	20,1	36,5	33,1	0,0	29,1
No, never	N	142	159	100	3	404	72	98	147	45	362
	%	46,4	51,6	67,6	100,0	52,8	58,0	47,1	63,1	97,9	59,2
Total	N	306	308	148	3	765	124	208	233	46	611
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE D/5 RESPONDENTS WHO SOMETIMES SPEAK L_2 IN ORDER TO MAKE A GOOD IMPRESSION. BY LANGUAGE AND BACKGROUND

Language Background		Afrikaners							ESSAS						
		Home language was L_1 but often spoke L_2 outside	Home language was L_1 but occasionally spoke L_2 outside	Home language was L_1 and never spoke L_2 outside	Home language was both L_1 and L_2 and often spoke L_2 outside	Home language was both L_1 and L_2 and occasionally spoke L_2 outside	Home language was L_2 and often spoke L_2 outside	TOTAL	Home language was L_1 but often spoke L_2 outside	Home language was L_1 but occasionally spoke L_2 outside	Home language was L_1 and never spoke L_2 outside	Home language was both L_1 and L_2 and often spoke L_2 outside	Home language was both L_1 and L_2 and occasionally spoke L_2 outside	Home language was L_2 and often spoke L_2 outside	TOTAL
Yes, often	N	40	44	13	13	1	0	111	20	13	4	12	2	8	59
	%	15,7	13,9	9,2	34,2	9,0	0,0	14,5	18,4	6,9	2,6	29,3	15,4	21,1	10,9
Yes, occasionally	N	89	116	37	15	5	0	262	35	72	31	7	6	5	156
	%	34,9	36,6	26,2	39,5	45,5	0,0	34,2	32,1	38,3	20,4	17,0	46,2	13,2	28,8
No, never	N	126	157	91	10	5	3	392	54	103	117	22	5	25	326
	%	49,4	49,5	64,5	26,3	45,5	100,0	51,2	49,5	54,8	77,0	53,7	38,5	65,8	60,3
Total	N	255	317	141	38	11	3	765	109	188	152	41	13	38	541
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE D/6 RESPONDENTS WHO SOMETIMES SPEAK L_2 IN ORDER TO MAKE A GOOD IMPRESSION. BY LANGUAGE AND EXPERIENCE

Language		Afrikaners					ESSAS				
Experience		Whole period	Up to 18 years	From 18 years	Never	Total	Whole period	Up to 18 years	From 18 years	Never	Total
Yes, often	N	73	8	11	0	92	62	0	2	1	65
	%	15,7	16,7	15,1	0,0	14,6	16,5	0	2,4	1,4	11,6
Yes, occasionally	N	170	11	21	11	213	121	6	29	6	162
	%	36,6	22,9	28,8	23,9	33,8	32,2	23,1	34,1	8,1	28,9
No, never	N	221	29	41	35	326	192	20	54	67	333
	%	47,6	60,4	56,1	76,1	51,7	51,2	76,9	63,5	90,5	59,5
Total	N	464	48	73	46	631	375	26	85	74	560
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE D/7

AFRIKANER RESPONDENTS WHO SOMETIMES SPEAK L_2 IN ORDER TO MAKE A GOOD IMPRESSION. BY LANGUAGE AND ENVIRONMENT

Environment Afrikaners		Never have contact with L_2	Occasionally have casual conversations in L_2	Occasionally have casual and serious conversations in L_2	Often have casual conversations in L_2	Often have casual and occasionally serious conversations in L_2	Often have casual and serious conversations in L_2	Occasionally have serious conversations in L_2	Often have serious conversations in L_2	Occasionally have casual and often serious conversations in L_2	TOTAL
Yes, often	N	6	11	17	10	12	49	0	1	6	112
	%	7,5	7,0	11,9	17,9	16,2	25,8	0,0	25,0	17,7	15,1
Yes, occasionally	N	13	58	59	15	32	56	1	2	16	252
	%	16,3	36,9	41,3	26,8	43,2	29,5	20,0	50,0	47,1	33,9
No, never	N	61	88	67	31	30	85	4	1	12	379
	%	76,3	56,0	46,9	55,4	40,5	44,7	80,0	25,0	35,3	51,0
Total	N	80	157	143	56	74	190	5	4	34	743
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE D/7

ESSA RESPONDENTS WHO SOMETIMES SPEAK L_2 IN ORDER TO MAKE A GOOD IMPRESSION. BY LANGUAGE AND ENVIRONMENT

Environment ESSAS		Never have contact with L_2	Occasionally have casual conversations in L_2	Occasionally have casual and serious conversations in L_2	Often have casual conversations in L_2	Often have casual and occasionally serious conversations in L_2	Often have casual and serious conversations in L_2	Occasionally have serious conversations in L_2	Often have serious conversations in L_2	Occasionally have casual and often serious conversations in L_2	TOTAL
Yes, often	N	3	8	9	6	13	35	0	0	1	75
	%	2,4	4,8	10,6	15,4	26,0	25,7	0,0	0,0	7,7	12,1
Yes, occasionally	N	17	67	26	16	15	32	0	0	2	175
	%	13,5	40,4	30,6	41,0	30,0	23,5	0,0	0,0	15,4	28,3
No, never	N	106	91	50	17	22	69	2	1	10	368
	%	84,1	54,9	58,8	43,6	44,0	50,7	100,0	100,0	76,9	59,6
Total	N	126	166	85	39	50	136	2	1	13	618
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TABLE D/8 RESPONDENTS WHO SOMETIMES SPEAK L_2 IN ORDER TO MAKE A GOOD IMPRESSION. BY LANGUAGE AND AREA OF RESIDENCE

Language		Afrikaners							ESSAS							
Area of Residence		Pretoria	Vaal Triangle	Johannesburg	Bloemfontein	Natal	Eastern Cape	Cape Town	Pretoria	Vaal Triangle	Johannesburg	Bloemfontein	Natal	Eastern Cape	Cape Town	Total
Yes, often	N	17	8	28	7	1	9	11	4	2	16	3	9	12	32	116
	%	11,0	14,3	18,3	11,3	9,1	16,4	12,5	13,3	25,0	9,6	18,8	8,9	15,8	21,3	13,0
Yes, occasionally	N	50	22	48	25	8	22	47	6	2	46	4	29	21	95	283
	%	32,5	39,3	31,4	40,3	72,7	40,0	53,4	20,0	25,0	27,5	25,0	28,7	27,6	63,3	31,8
No, never	N	87	26	77	30	2	24	30	20	4	105	9	63	43	23	490
	%	56,5	46,4	50,3	48,4	18,2	43,6	34,1	66,7	50,0	62,9	56,3	62,4	56,6	15,3	55,1
Total	N	154	56	153	62	11	55	88	30	8	167	16	101	76	150	889
	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AGHEYISI, R. *and* FISHMAN, J.A. 1970. "Language Attitude Studies". A brief Survey of Methodological Approaches. In *Anthropological Linguistics*. Vol. 12 No. 5, May 1970, pp. 137-157.

ALLPORT, G.W. 1935. "Attitudes" *in* MURCHISON, C.M. *Handbook of Social Psychology*. Worcester, Mass., Clark University Press, pp. 798-884.

ALLPORT, G.W., 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading, Mass., Addison - Wesley.

ANISFIELD, E. *and* LAMBERT, W.E., 1964. "Evaluative reactions of bilingual and monolingual children to spoken languages" in *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1964, 69, 89-97.

ARGYLE, Michael, 1969. *Social Interaction*. London, Methuen.

BERNSTEIN, Basil, 1971. *Class, Codes and Control*. Volume 1: Theoretical Studies towards a Sociology of Language. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

BOGARDUS, E.S. 1936. *Introduction to Social Research*. Los Angeles, Suttonhouse.

CLOETE, J.J.N., 1965. *Bilingualism in the public sector in South Africa*. (Roneod).

DEUTSCH, M. *and* KRAUSS, R.M. 1965. *Theories in Social Psychology*. New York, Basic Books Inc.

FANAROFF, Deborah, 1972. *South African English Dialect:* a Literature Survey. Pretoria, Human Sciences Research Council.

FISHER, J., 1969. *The Afrikaners*. London, Cassel.

FISHMAN, J.A., 1969 "Bilingual attitudes and behaviors" in *Language Sciences* (April, 1969) 5-9.

FISHMAN, J.A. *et al.*, 1966. *Language Loyalty in the United States. The Maintenance and Perpetuation of Non-English Mother Tongues by American Ethnic and Religious Groups*. The Hague, Mouton.

FISHMAN, J.A. *et al.*, 1971. *Bilingualism in the Barrio*. Bloomington, Indiana University.

GARDNER, R.C. *and* LAMBERT, W.E., 1959. "Motivational variables in second-language acquisition" in *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 1959, 13, 266-272.

GARDNER, R.C. *and* LAMBERT, W.E., 1969. *Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning*. Rowley, Mass., Newbury House.

HAUPTFLEISCH, T., 1975. *Research into the position of the official languages in the educational system of Whites in South Africa: a literature survey*. Pretoria, Human Sciences Research Council.

JACOBS, G.F. HUDSON, W. *and* BIESHEUVEL, S., 1966. *Suid-Afrikaners onder die soeklig. 'n Wetenskaplike ontleding van hedendaagse houdings*. Kaapstad, Purnell *en* Seuns, S.A.

JAHODA, M. *and* WARREN, M., 1966. *Attitudes. Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth, Penguin.

KENNEY, J.F. *and* KEEPING, E.S. 1954. *Mathematics of Statistics*. Part one. Princeton, D. van Nostrand.

LABOV, William, 1966. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington Center for Applied Linguistics.

LAMBERT, W. *and* LAMBERT, W.E., 1964. *Social Psychology.* Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.

LAMBERT, W.E., 1961. "A cross-national comparison of ethnocentrism, perception of similars and affection vis-a-vis other peoples" in *Acta Psychologica*, Vol. XIX (1961), pp. 612-619.

LAMBERT, W.E., 1972. *Language, Psychology and Culture.* Ed. Anwar S. Dill. Stanford, Stanford University Press.

LAMBERT, W.E. *et al.*, 1963. "Attitudinal and Cognitive Aspects of intensive study of a second language" in *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 1963, Vol. 66, No. 4, 358-368.

LAMBERT, W.E. *et al.*, 1968. "A study of the roles of attitudes and motivation in second-language learning *in* FISHMAN, J.A. *Readings in the Sociology of Language.* The Hague, Mouton, 1968, pp. 473-491.

LANHAM, L.W., 1974. "Spoken English in South Africa" in *New Nation*, September 1974, pp. 17-20.

LANHAM, L.W., 1975. "Towards a theory in the Sociology of Language". Paper read at the *International Conference on Linguistics in Central and Southern Africa*, University of Rhodesia, Salisbury, 9-13th December, 1975.

LEVER, H. 1966. *A comparative study of social distance among various groups in the White high school population of Johannesburg.* Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of the Witwatersrand.

LINDZEY, G. *and* ARANSON, E., 1968. *The Handbook of Social Psychology.* Volume 1. Reading, Mass., Addison-Wesley.

MALHERBE, E.G., 1966. *Demographic and socio-political forces determining the position of English in the South African Republic.* Johannesburg, English Academy.

NADER, Laura, 1968. "A note on attitudes and the use of language" *in* FISHMAN, J.A. *Readings in the sociology of language*, The Hague, Mouton, 1968. pp. 276-281.

OSGOOD, C.F., SUCI, G.J.,TANNENBAUM, P.H., 1957. *The measurement of meaning.* Urbana, University of Illinois Press.

PEAL, E. *and* LAMBERT, W.E., 1962. "The relation of bilingualism to intelligence" in *Psychological Monographs*, 1962, 76 (27 No. 546).

PENN, C. *and* STAFFORD, S., 1971. "The importance of dialect in the perception of occupation in South Africa". in *Journal of Behavioral Science* 1971, 1, (3) p. 113-116.

PIENAAR, P. de V. (Ed.), 1968. *Kultuurgeskiedenis van die Afrikaner.* Kaapstad, Nasionale Boekhandel.

PRIDE, J.B., 1971. *The Social Meaning of Language.* London, Oxford University Press.

PRINSLOO, K.P., 1972. *Die Tweetaligheid van twee groepe universiteitstudente en hul ingesteldhede teenoor die tweede taal - 'n voorondersoek tot 'n landswye opname.* Pretoria, Raad vir Geesteswetenskaplike Navorsing.

ROKEACH, Milton, 1969. *Beliefs, Attitudes and Values: a theory of organization and change.* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Inc.

SARGENT, S.S. *and* WILLIAMSON, R.C., 1958. *Social Psychology. An Introduction to the Study of Human Relations.* New York, Ronald Press Co.

SCHLEMMER, L., 1974(a). "The Afrikaners: Youth and Change" in *Optima* Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 56-65.

SCHLEMMER, L. 1974(b). "English-speaking South Africans today: identity, integration into the broader national community, and concepts of their role in national affairs". A Paper read at the National Conference - *English-speaking South Africa: an assessment*, Grahamstown 15-19 July 1974 (Photocopy).

SHERIF, M. *and* SHERIF, C.W., 1969. *Social Psychology*. New York, Harper & Row.

SOUTH AFRICA (REPUBLIC), DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION, 1974. *South Africa 1974 Official Yearbook of the Republic of South Africa*. Johannesburg, Perskor.

STRIJDOM, H.G., 1971. *Sosiale status en die verband daarvan met vryetydsaktiwiteite, houdings en aspirasies van Afrikaanssprekende standerd ses-seuns*. Pretoria, Raad vir Geesteswetenskaplike Navorsing.

THURSTONE, L.L. *and* CHAVE, E.J., 1929 *The Measurement of Attitude*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

VAN DER MERWE, H.W., ASHLEY, M.J., CHARTON, N.C.J. *and* HUBER, B.J., 1974. *White South African Elites. A study of incumbents of top positions in the Republic of South Africa*. Cape Town, Juta.

WATTS, H.L., 1974. "A social and demographic portrait of English-speaking White South Africans". A paper read at the National Conference - *English-speaking South Africa: an assessment*. Grahamstown, 15-19 July, 1974 (Photocopy).

RGN-PUBLIKASIES SEDERT 1 JULIE 1977
HSRC PUBLICATIONS SINCE 1 JULY 1977

'n Volledige lys van RGN-publikasies is op aanvraag verkrygbaar. Eksemplare van publikasies wat uit druk is, kan deur biblioteekdienste verkry word.

A complete list of HSRC publications is available on request. Copies of publications which are out of print can be obtained through library services.

GESKIEDENIS/HISTORY

KOTZÉ, H.P. Geslagsregister van Theunis Johannes Kotzee en Maria Gloudina Louw. 1978 R7,20

VAN DER BIJL, JOHANNES Die familie Roux. 1978 R11,15

FERREIRA, O.J.O. Krijgsgevangenschap van L.C. Ruijssenaers. 1978 R8,00

INLIGTING/INFORMATION

HUMANITAS - Vol. 4 No. 2 Tydskrif vir navorsing in die geesteswetenskappe. 1978 R6,75

HUMANITAS - Vol. 4 No. 2 Journal for research in the human sciences. 1978 R6,75

JAARVERSLAG - Verskyn jaarliks. Gratis.

ANNUAL REPORT - Published once a year. Gratis.

IN-30 GEGGUS, C. Toekennings beskikbaar vir nagraadse studie in die RSA en in die buiteland/ Awards available for post-graduate study in the RSA and overseas.
RGN Voorligtingsreeks VR-8/ HSRC Guidance Series GS-8. 1977 R4,05

IN-31 COETZEE, C.J.S. *en* GEGGUS, CAROLINE Opleiding en beroepsgeleenthede vir skoolverlaters voor standerd tien. RGN Voorligtingsreeks VR-3. 1978 R1,65

IN-31 COETZEE, C.J.S. *and* GEGGUS, CAROLINE Training and career opportunities for school-leavers before standard ten. HSRC Guidance Series GS-3 1978 R1,65

KOMMUNIKASIE/COMMUNICATION

KOMM-14 DU PREEZ, P.H. 'n Ondersoek na tydbenuttings- en agtergrondfaktore wat verband hou met die studiegewoontes en -houdings van standerd agt-leerlinge: 'n Voor-televisie-opname. 1978 R2,30

MANNEKRAG/MANPOWER

MM-65 SMIT, P.C. Die arbeidsituasie van ingenieurstegnici in die RSA. 1977 R1,85

MM-66 WESSELS, DINA, M. Vroue in bedryfswerk. 1977 R1,80

MM-67 EBERSOHN, D. Beroepsfunksies van argitekte in 1976. 1977 R3,50

MM-68 LOTZ, J.W. The role, function and training of Black first-line supervisors in some decentralized industries. 1977 R2,45

MM-69 CILLIERS, G.J. Die werksituasie van nuwe toetreders tot die arbeidsmag. 1977 R2,50

TALENTOPNAME/TALENT SURVEY

MT-40 ROOS, W.L. Projek Talentopname: Navorsingsbevindings - 1976. 1977 R0,60

MT-40 ROOS, W.L. Project Talent Survey: Research findings - 1976. 1977 R0,60

MT-41 SCHOEMAN, W.J. Die voorspelling van skolastiese sukses. 1978 R4,40

MT-42 BESTER, C.L. Persoonlikheidsvergelykende studie van voorstanders en teenstanders van lyfstraf. 1978 R1,30

NAVORSINGSONTWIKKELING/RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT

NAVORSINGSBULLETIN - Verskyn tien keer per jaar.
RESEARCH BULLETIN - Ten issues per annum.

RSA 2000 - Gesprek met die toekoms. Veskyn twee keer per jaar.
RSA 2000 - Dialogue with the future. Two issues per annum.

Kwic-indeks van Navorsingsbulletins, Volume 6 1976. 1977
Kwic Index of Research Bulletins, Volume 6 1976. 1977

Kwic-indeks van Navorsingsbulletins, Volume 7 1977. 1978
Kwic Index of Research Bulletins, Volume 7 1977. 1978

OPVOEDKUNDE/EDUCATION

0-9 VENTER, H.C.A. The place of the school library in education. 1977 R1,15

0-14 BIEBUYCK, L.J.T. Introduction of a third and fourth language in South African schools. 1973 (Reprint 1977) R2,65

0-44 DE VAAL, D.J. *en* VAN DEN BERG, D.J. Die ontwerp en toepassing van kriteria vir die samestelling van gedifferensieerde wiskundesillabusse. 1978 R2,30

0-44 DE VAAL, D.J. *and* VAN DEN BERG, D.J. Design and implementation of criteria for the compilation of differentiated Mathematics syllabuses. 1978 R2,30

0-55 ENGELBRECHT, S.W.H. Drug abuse as an educational problem. 1977 R1,95

0-56 STRYDOM, A.E. Drug abuse as a problem of self-realization. 1977 R1,30

0-57 GOUWS, M. Education for mentally highly gifted pupils: A preliminary study. 1977 R1,45

0-59 VENTER, H.C.A. Equal remuneration for men and women in the teaching profession. 1977 R2,15

0-59 VENTER, H.C.A. Gelyke besoldiging vir mans en vroue in die onderwys. 1977 R2,15

0-63 NEL, A. Verantwoordelikheid: 'n Opvoedkundige perspektief. Deel 1: 'n Struktuuranalise van verantwoordelikheid. 1977 R1,85

0-64 NEL, A. Verantwoordelikheid: 'n Opvoedkundige perspektief. Deel 2: Verantwoordelikheid van die Bantoe binne Westerse kultuurverband. 1977 R2,35

0-64 NEL, A. Responsibility: An educational perspective. Part 2: Responsibility of the Bantu in a Western Cultural context. 1978 R1,75

0-65 SPIES, P.G. VAN Z. Professionele beheeruitoefening oor die onderwysberoep in die RSA. 1977 R1,30

0-65 SPIES, P.G. VAN Z. Professional control over the teaching profession in the RSA. 1978 R0,95

0-68 FOURIE, W.N. Leeshulpverlening: Verskillende benaderingswyses. 1977 R1,85

0-69 HAASBROEK, J.B. Leerteorië. Deel 1: Leerteorië vanaf die klassieke filosofie tot die veldteorie van Kurt Lewin. 1978 R5,20

0-71 VAN DEN BERG, D.J. Navorsingstendense met betrekking tot die onderrig van Wiskunde in enkele Westerse lande. 1977 R1,00

0-72 BEUKES, J.H. Skoolvoorligting in Oostenryk. 1977 R0,95

0-73 MAAT, S.J. Leesonderrigmetodiek van Afrikaans. 1977 R2,10

0-74 NEL, A. Verantwoordelikheid: 'n Opvoedkundige perspektief. Deel 3. Opvoeding van die Swartkind. 1978 R11,10

0-74 NEL, A. Responsibility: An educational perspective. Part 3. The education of the Black child. 1978 R11,40

0-76 LIEBENBERG, C.R. Die implementering van televisie by onderwysersopleiding in die RSA. 1978 R2,05

0-79 CARSTENS, J.H. Skoolvoorligting in Frankryk. 1978 R1,40

PSIGOMETRIKA/PSYCHOMETRICS

P-15 DE VILLIERS, L. Design and standardization of the senior aptitude tests for Indian South Africans. 1977 R3,15

P-16 KRITZINGER, L.J.R. Construction and standardization of a scholastic achievement test for English first language standard 6. 1977 R2,35

P-18 KRITZINGER, L.J.R. Report on the scholastic achievement test for English second language standard 1. 1978 R4,75

P-20 MARITZ, J.D.G. Tegniese verslag oor die gestandaardiseerde skolastiese prestasietoetse in Afrikaans tweede taal vir standerds 5, 6 en 7. 1978 R3,95

SOSIOLOGIE, DEMOGRAFIE EN KRIMINOLOGIE/SOCIOLOGY, DEMOGRAPHY AND CRIMINOLOGY

S-47 SMEDLEY, LINDA N. Czechoslovakian refugees in Pretoria: A follow-up study. 1977 R2,10

S-49 STRIJDOM, H.G. *en* SCHURINK, W.J. Primêre viktimisasie in Soweto. 1977 R1,50

S-51 VAN DER BURGH, C. Smoking and drinking patterns of Whites: 1975. 1978 R1,30

S-53 GROENEWALD, H.J. Fertility and family planning in Atteridgeville: Data for 1969, 1974 and 1975. 1978 R1,15

S-54 LÖTTER, J.M. Certain aspects of human fertility in rural Bophuthatswana. 1978 R0,95

STATISTIEK/STATISTICS

WS-20 VAN RENSBURG, F.A.J. Graduation trends for Non-Whites at South African universities 1960-1975, with projections to 1990. 1977 R4,50

WS-21 VAN RENSBURG, L.S.J. Onderwystendense: Statistiek sedert 1910. A_2 Kleurlingstudente aan universiteite. 1977 R2,80

TAAL, LETTERE EN KUNS/LANGUAGES, LITERATURE AND ARTS

TLK/L-5 SCHEFFER, P. Stedelike Blanke Suid-Afrikaners se koop-, leen- en leesgewoontes met betrekking tot boeke. 1977 R4,35

TLK/L-6 HAUPTFLEISCH, T. Language loyalty in South Africa Volume 1: Bilingual policy in South Africa - Opinions of White adults in urban areas. 1977 R3,65

TLK/L-7 SCHURING, G.K. 'n Veeltalige Samelewing: Deel 2. Afrikaans en Engels onder Swartmense in die RSA. 1977 R1,40

BOTHA, RO[illegible]LIE *en/and* VILJOEN, WILMA. Bronnegids vir Toneel, Ballet, Rolprente, Hoorspele en Televisie. Nuwe reeks, deel IV/Source Guide for Drama, Ballet, Films, Radio Plays and Television. New Series, volume IV, 1973. 1977 R4,40

VILJOEN, WILMA. Bronnegids vir Toneel, Ballet, Rolprente, Hoorspele en Televisie. Nuwe reeks, deel V/Source Guide for Drama, Ballet, Films, Radio Plays and Television. New Series, volume V 1974. 1977 R5,25

NIENABER, G.S. *en* RAPER, P.E. Toponymica Hottentotica A** H-Z. Naamkundereeks nr. 7 1977 R12,00

JOUBERT, ESTER. Bronnegids by die studie van die Afrikaanse taal en letterkunde. Nuwe reeks, deel 4. 1977 R2,75

TLK/L-8 HAUPTFLEISCH, T. Language loyalty in South Africa. Volume 2: Using and improving usage in the second language - some opinions of White adults in urban areas. 1978 R3,65